

THE
CHURCH QUARTERLY REVIEW.

N^O LXIII. APRIL 1891.

ART. I.—BISHOP WESTCOTT ON THE HEBREWS.

- 1 *The Epistle to the Hebrews: the Greek Text with Notes and Essays.* By BROOKE FOSS WESTCOTT, D.D., D.C.L., Lord Bishop of Durham. (London, 1889.)
- 2 ἸΠΟΣ ΕΒΡΑΙΟΥΣ. The Epistle to the Hebrews, with Notes. By C. J. VAUGHAN, D.D., Dean of Llandaff. (London, 1890.)

A GREAT interest has recently been awakened in the Epistle to the Hebrews. We have received the finished and elaborate work of one of our greatest scholars, the Bishop of Durham; and along with it the careful performance of the Dean of Llandaff; somewhat later also—too late for detailed notice—the more popular and eminently useful work of Prebendary Sadler.¹ Nor is this awakened interest without good and just ground. Viewed on its human side there is no book in the Canon which is more full of life, personality, and interest; none which is so replete with far-reaching views, as is the Epistle to the Hebrews. There is also none which is of more momentous interest to the theologian. Nor is the Epistle less important to the historian. Here we have a picture of the inner life and deepest thought; of the doubts, difficulties, dangers, and shipwrecks, of a portion of the Church at the close of the first apostolic period. We have the principles laid down and expounded, which shaped the course of the subsequent Church, especially in the matter of worship, and made it to be what it subsequently became. There is also something eminently fascinating in the purely historical problem connected with the authorship. Was there, or was there not, a second intellect, great and commanding as that of St. Paul, all along enriching the development of the apo-

¹ For a fuller account of Vaughan and Sadler see the 'Short Notices' in the present Number.

370635

stolic Church, and only here, as if by accident, breaking forth into the light?

Bishop Westcott inclines to the idea of an unknown, or not otherwise known, author, an apostle of the circumcision. For reasons which we shall subsequently give, we are disposed to adhere to the traditional view of the authorship, probably indirect, of St. Paul. We think the difficulties connected with the denial of the Pauline authorship are greater than those that beset its affirmation. Nevertheless it may be admitted that the point cannot be determined with certainty; and there seems a disposition to leave it as it stands, vague and undefined, a kind of fascinating enigma. The Epistle, as Delitzsch elegantly expresses it, 'resembles in these respects the great Melchizedek of sacred story of whom its central portion treats. Like him it marches forth in lonely royal and sacerdotal dignity; and like him it is ἀγευεαλόγητος.'¹ And we may add, like a Greater than him it abideth for ever. For this is the remarkable thing about it. It has forced its way to an undisputed place in the Canon. Received, at first, undoubtingly in the East, it was disputed in the West; chiefly on the ground of its wanting clear apostolic authority. But the force of its inspiration by degrees overcame all opposition; and it ended by receiving in the West the same undoubting acceptance which it always had in the East.

Bishop Westcott's treatise is, and will doubtless finally take its place as, a classical work. This it deserves, not only from the fulness and completeness of the materials he has assembled, and the refined and scholarly judgment with which they are handled, but from the clear, the just, and the measured views which he takes on all the difficult problems connected with the Epistle. There is a wonderful charm too in his wider views, regarding the deep subjects treated of in the Epistle. Many of his observations are striking and original; many, too, are eminently suggestive, opening up, as they do, fine reaches of thought. And yet, looking at the matter from a dogmatic point of view, there is in this, as in his other writings, as a general result, vagueness. The argumentation and the ideas of the Epistle are singularly clean-cut and far-reaching, nor do they altogether escape the observation of such a careful student; and yet somehow as an ultimate result they melt away and disappear. In reading through his work we have again and again had suggested to us the apostolic injunction, *μή ποτε παραρῶμεν*. Things of

¹ *Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews*, vol. i. p. 4, Clark's translation.

deep moment, which it is of the utmost importance we should grasp and hold fast, glide away, or we glide away from them.

His introduction to the Epistle is especially admirable. In it we have a well-assorted collection of almost everything a student requires. It is in work of this kind that the eminent author is particularly distinguished. We have only to look at the headings of this part to see how thoroughly the work has been done. He deals first of all with the text; and here in brief space we have all the apparatus pointed out. Then follow discussions on the title, and the position of the Epistle in New Testament collections. Next we come to the consideration of the destination, date, and place of writing; and these points are followed by discussions on the style and language, the plan and characteristics of the Epistle. Very interesting is the part devoted to the question of the original language. The student will remember that St. Clement of Alexandria mentions that the Epistle was written by St. Paul in Hebrew, and that St. Luke translated it and published it to the Greeks. The idea of a Hebrew original has been from time to time maintained, and has been in our day warmly advocated by Biesenthal and others. Bishop Westcott decides against the Hebrew original. On this point we shall have more to say presently. In the meanwhile, to complete the enumeration of the particulars of the introduction, we have the important section on the history and authorship; and a comparison of the Epistle with that of St. Barnabas. No one will deny that the treatment of all these points by the author is a model of elegant and refined scholarship.

By far the most important of these questions is the one regarding the authorship; and on this we should like to make a few observations. It is seen that, as bearing on this point, the questions of the destination of the Epistle and the place from which it was written have importance. And we may first enquire whether anything can certainly be concluded on these two points.

We believe the first of these preliminary points can be determined with tolerable certainty. It is clear from the Epistle that it was written to a localized community, which had been visited by the author and which he hopes to visit again. This at once disposes of the idea that it might be addressed to Hebrews generally; or to Hebrews scattered over a wide extent, as, for instance, the Hebrews resident in Asia Minor. Another thing is clear from the Epistle. It was a community composed exclusively of Hebrews; for there is not the slightest trace of the presence of Gentile

converts. This further narrows the question. In fact there is only one community, the Church of Jerusalem, to which this applies; of which Eusebius says that up to the time of Hadrian it was composed of Hebrews only. Another thing which points to the Church of Jerusalem is, that the Epistle supposes the temple worship going on in the midst of the Church which is addressed. Putting all these things together it is tolerably certain that the Epistle was written to the Church of Jerusalem.

More doubts have been raised in regard to the place whence the Epistle was written. It is true that it lies on the surface to conclude that it was written from Italy, and probably from Rome. This we gather from the expression 'They of Italy salute you.' But it has been pointed out that the words *οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰταλίας* might also mean the Italian brethren (who are here), that is, in the place where the author was writing; so that it is left in doubt whether it was really written from Italy or from some other place. Nevertheless, we are quite certain that the meaning which lies on the surface is the true one. It is the natural inference from the words as they stand, and as such, is to be preferred. Critics too often forget that the documents they are criticizing are not legal instruments; or documents written with a view to the ingenuity of critics of a far distant age. They are popular documents; and, being so, their surface meaning is always to be taken, unless some strong reason can be alleged against it. How easily we might discredit the best ascertained statements of modern documents, if we were to subject the language to minute philological analysis, and raise to the status of a positive doubt every defect of statement, every gap in the information, or every logical flaw. In the present case, if the writer was at some other place, we might naturally expect that the *presence* of the Italian brethren at that place would have been mentioned. The sentence would probably have run, 'There are brethren here from Italy who salute you.' The only circumstance in which the presence of Italian brethren could have been taken for granted would be that he was writing in their midst. We therefore conclude that the Epistle was written from Italy, and probably from Rome.

The place of writing is not without its importance, because it is one in a chain of circumstances which all point to the circle of St. Paul as that from which the Epistle emanated. If it were written from Rome it was probably written by St. Paul, because it is difficult to suppose that any other apostle, qualified to write it, was then in Rome. But before going on

to consider the arguments on the one side and on the other, it may be well to give a brief outline of the external testimony to the Epistle and its author. The reader will find all the evidence bearing on this point in the tractate of Bishop Westcott. The Epistle was known to St. Clement of Rome; for though he does not quote it by name, his Epistle to the Corinthians shows that he was familiar with its contents. We find him using its words and forms of expression, and in one case quoting a remarkable sentence. It was also probably known to the Shepherd of Hermas, to St. Polycarp, and to Justin Martyr. On the other hand it is not mentioned in the Muratorian Canon; and it is important to note, that apparently that document excludes it from the writings of St. Paul, inasmuch as it uses of St. Paul the expression '*septem scribit ecclesiis*.'

When we come to the end of the second century we have evidence of a knowledge of the Epistle in Alexandria, North Africa, Italy, and the West of Europe. But the views that were taken of it in these Churches were different and conflicting, and it is this variance which occasions all our difficulty. In Alexandria it was held to be, at least indirectly, the work of St. Paul, and of canonical authority. St. Clement of Alexandria, Origen, and, after them, Eusebius, took this view. The same was also the view taken by Alexander of Alexandria, St. Athanasius, and generally by all the Fathers of the Eastern Church. They used the Epistle, quoted it as the work of St. Paul, and attributed to it canonical authority. On the other hand, very different views of it were taken in Rome and in the West. In North Africa it was known through a Latin translation; but it does not appear to have had a place in the Canon, or to have been held to be by St. Paul. Tertullian knew it, and speaks of it as being 'more widely received among the Churches than the "Shepherd."' From which expression we infer that it only stood on the borders of the Canon. The perplexing thing, however, is, that instead of attributing it, like the Eastern Churches, to St. Paul, he alone, among the primitive Fathers, assigns it to St. Barnabas. The limited use of the Epistle in the African Churches is also inferred from the fact that St. Cyprian does not quote it. And it is also observable that St. Cyprian applies to St. Paul the common Western expression '*septem scribit ecclesiis*,' from which it is gathered that if he knew it, he did not think it to be by St. Paul.

Coming to Italy and Western Europe, we find that in the earliest times it was not thought to be by St. Paul, and in

consequence it was excluded from the Canon. Bishop Westcott remarks :

‘Hippolytus (Lagarde, pp. 64, 89, 118, 149) and Irenæus (Eusebius, *H. E.* v. 26) were acquainted with it, but they held that it “was not Paul’s” (Stephen Gobar. ap. Phot. Cod. 232); and if Irenæus had held it to be authoritative Scripture, he could hardly have failed to use it freely in his book against heresies. Caius also reckoned only thirteen epistles of St. Paul (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 20; Hier. *De Vir. ill.* 59); and Eusebius, where he mentions the fact, adds that the opinion “was still held by some Romans” (p. lxiv).

To complete the evidence it only remains to be remarked that a change in the Western view was ultimately brought about, mainly by St. Jerome. He was intimately acquainted with the Eastern tradition, and through his writings he influenced the opinions of the West. The West gradually came round to the Eastern view, though all traces of doubt were by no means excluded.

Such is a brief statement of the original evidence on this perplexing point. It is clear that a more definite view can only be obtained by examining closely the explicit statements of St. Clement of Alexandria and Origen, and bringing to our aid considerations of internal evidence.

The following is the account Eusebius gives of the testimony of St. Clement :

‘Clement,’ he writes, ‘says, in his Outlines, that the epistle is Paul’s, and that it was written to Hebrews in the Hebrew language, and that Luke translated it with zealous care and published it to the Greeks; whence it is that the same complexion of style is found in the translation of this epistle and in the Acts. [Further] that the [ordinary] phrase “Paul, an Apostle,” was not placed at the head of the epistle for good reason; for, he says, in writing to Hebrews, who had formed a prejudice against him and viewed him with suspicion, he was wise not to repel them at the beginning by setting his name there.’¹

Another reason for the omission of St. Paul’s name is also given, which Eusebius gives in Clement’s own words :

‘The blessed presbyter [Pantænus] used to say: Since the Lord was sent to the Hebrews, as being the Apostle of the Almighty, Paul, through modesty, as was natural since he had been sent to the Gentiles, does not style himself Apostle of the Hebrews, both for the sake of the honour due to the Lord, and because it was a work of supererogation for him to write to the Hebrews, since he was herald and apostle of the Gentiles.’

This is the earliest account of the Epistle which has come down to us, and it is of great importance. It is as an im-

¹ Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 14; quoted Westcott, p. lxvii.

portant notice that Eusebius has selected and preserved it to us. If we look at the content of it, we see that it is in the highest degree improbable that St. Clement would have invented the idea of a Hebrew original, and of its translation or interpretation by St. Luke, merely to explain a difficulty: for this good reason, that the statement is given as a fact and not as a hypothesis. St. Clement must have had some ground for it in tradition; and from the way in which the blessed presbyter is mentioned it is probable that he heard of it through him. If such was the case a little consideration will show its importance. The recollection of Pantænus would go far back towards the apostolic age; and he must have been in frequent and confidential intercourse with all the leaders in the Church during the early part of the second century. Christians were then a small body, and closely knit together, and a fact of this description, if it were a fact, was likely to be known and handed on. There is thus much probability that there is ground for the assertion of St. Clement regarding a Hebrew original and its translation. And yet there are difficulties in the way of accepting this, so considerable, that Bishop Westcott decides against it, though we think wrongly.

These difficulties arise from internal evidence, and we give them in Bishop Westcott's words. He says:

'Internal evidence appears to establish absolutely beyond question that the Greek text is original, and not a translation from any form of Aramaic. The vocabulary, the style, the rhetorical characteristics of the work, all lead to the same conclusion. It is (for example) impossible to imagine any Aramaic phrase which could have suggested to a translator the opening clause of the epistle, *πολυμερῶς καὶ πολυτρόπως*; and similar difficulties offer themselves throughout the book in the free and masterly use of compound words which have no Aramaic equivalents (*e.g.* *μετριοπαθεῖν*, v. 2; *εὐπερίστατος*, xii. 1). The structure of the periods is bold and complicated, and the arrangement of the words is often singularly expressive (*e.g.* ii. 9). Paronomasias (*e.g.* i. 1; ii. 10; v. 8; vii. 23 f.; ix. 28; x. 34, 38 f.) are at least more likely to have been due to the writer than to have been introduced or imitated by a translator. But, on the other hand, stress must not be laid on a (falsely) assumed change in the meaning of *διαθήκη* in ix. 15 ff., or the obviously fortuitous hexameter in the common text of xii. 13.

'A still more decisive proof that the Greek text is original lies in the fact that the quotations from the O. T. are all (except x. 30; Deut. xxxii. 35) taken from the Septuagint even when the Septuagint differs from the Hebrew (*e.g.* ii. 7, *παρ' ἀγγέλους*; x. 38, *καὶ ἐὰν ἵπποστέλῃται*; xii. 5 f. *μαστιγῶι*). And arguments are based on peculiarities of the Septuagint, so that the quotations cannot have been

first introduced in the translation from Aramaic to Greek (e.g. x. 5 ff. *σῶμα καθρητίσω*; xii. 26 f. *ἁπαξ*)' (p. xxxiv).

We admit at once that these reasonings would be perfectly conclusive on the supposition that the Greek was a literal translation of the Hebrew. It is, however, a serious step to discredit a testimony so ancient and so well authenticated as that of St. Clement. It certainly ought not to be done unless it is clearly unavoidable. Hence we are led to enquire whether it is necessary to suppose a literal translation. If we look again at the words of St. Clement we see that there is much in them which militates against this idea. The word expressive of St. Luke's part in the work, *μεθερμηνεύσαντα*, would apply both to a literal and a substantial rendering; nor is there much to be gathered from the adverb *φιλοτίμως*, though had the rendering been a literal one we might have expected *ἀκριβώς*. Then the way in which the expression 'published it to the Greeks' follows the statement about interpretation, almost suggests the idea of a remodelling of the work to adapt it to that purpose. What St. Clement says is, that St. Luke interpreted the Epistle with zealous care and published it to the Greeks; and then he adds, that this is the reason why the same complexion of style is found in it as in the Acts. The latter expression seems to exclude the idea of a literal translation; for there would be no scope in such an undertaking for the exhibition of St. Luke's peculiarities of style and language. Unless a certain degree of freedom in the rendering were allowed, the peculiarities of St. Luke could have found no expression. On the whole we are inclined to the opinion that what St. Clement had in his mind was a free rendering.

Let us consider whether such a free rendering can be supposed as possible, or at all probable. Unhappily we have no data to determine the exact circumstances under which St. Paul wrote, if he did write. It might, however, have been a short time after the martyrdom of St. James. It is in the highest degree probable that this event was a most disastrous one for the Church of Jerusalem. Everything we know of St. James seems to indicate that he was a man of vast influence and power. It could not, therefore, fail but that his removal would react upon the Church. It is conceivable that many of the faithful who leaned upon him would now feel themselves without support. Then there was the growing enmity of the Jews, and the exclusion of believers in Christ from the temple worship. We can understand the intense pain that many Hebrew Christians would feel at this exclu-

sion. It might be also that the unbelieving Jews were active in proselytizing Christians; that they were pushing home the difficulty about temple worship, and that many feeble Christians were shaken by their arguments, and were renouncing or in danger of renouncing, their faith in Christ. St. Paul, although unacceptable to the great body of Hebrew Christians, had, probably, amongst them some who were his friends. And if we suppose that he was made aware of this dangerous crisis in the Church, we can easily see how he might interfere. He may have written at once through his friends an Epistle to the Hebrew Church, in Hebrew, withholding his name, in which he uttered warnings against apostasy, and showed that the temple worship was but a shadow of good things to come, and that Christians had a worship and a sacrifice far higher than that of the temple. If such an Epistle were written, we can see that its subject was one which was well calculated for the edification of the whole Church. At the same time the Epistle, in the form in which it was written, might not have been adapted for this purpose. It might have been shorter than our present Epistle, or it might have contained particulars not suited for general circulation. If such were the case it is conceivable he might have commissioned St. Luke to write it out in a new form in Greek, and that he adopted this form and sanctioned its publication to the Greeks.

This account, though not without some foundation, is in a great measure conjectural. But it is given only with a view to show that circumstances are easily conceivable which would explain and justify the account of St. Clement, from which the inference is that the real circumstances, if we only knew them, would probably do the same. After all, the points assured to us by St. Clement are that St. Paul did write to the Hebrews, and that, by what was probably a free rendering by St. Luke, his Epistle took its present shape. The testimony of Origen, although differing in some respects from that of St. Clement, yet agrees with him on the point of a free rendering of what was in substance the thought of St. Paul. After remarking on the difference of style of our Epistle from those of St. Paul, he proceeds in words recorded by Eusebius:—

‘If I were to express my own opinion, I should say that the thoughts are the thoughts of the Apostle, but the language and the composition that of one who recalled from memory, and, as it were, made notes of what was said by his master. If, therefore, any Church holds this epistle as Paul’s, let it be approved for this also; for it was not without reason that the men of old time have handed

it down as Paul's. But who wrote the epistle God only knows certainly. The account that has reached us is twofold. Some say that Clement, who became Bishop of the Romans, wrote the epistle; others that Luke wrote it, who wrote the Gospel and the Acts. But on this I will say no more.¹

Origen was further removed from apostolic times, and had not the same sources of information as St. Clement. His whole testimony is consequently more vague, and part of what St. Clement witnesses to drops out from his account. We see that he says nothing of a Hebrew original, or indeed that St. Paul wrote the Epistle in its first shape. Some have concluded from this that he discredited the idea; but we think it more probable that he merely substituted for the old tradition his own theory as given above. What is observable is that he bears witness to two facts of great importance, viz. first, that the Epistle had been handed down by the men of old time as St. Paul's, and secondly that, according to the same tradition, it was thrown into its present shape by St. Clement or St. Luke. Bishop Westcott gives what we think conclusive reasons against St. Clement, so that St. Luke alone remains in the old tradition as the probable interpreter.

If we accept the testimony of St. Clement as the oldest and best, it becomes important to enquire whether there is anything in the composition and style of the Epistle that reminds us of St. Luke. On this point the judgment of Bishop Westcott is of the greatest weight. His finished scholarship and great knowledge of Greek make him eminently qualified to speak with authority. His judgment on the point is given in the following words:

'It has been already seen that the earliest scholars who speak of the epistle notice its likeness in style to the writings of St. Luke; and when every allowance has been made for coincidences which consist in forms of expression which are found also in the LXX or in other writers of the New Testament, or in late Greek generally, the likeness is unquestionably remarkable. No one can work independently at the epistle without observing it. But it is not possible to establish any sure conclusion on such a resemblance. The author of the epistle may have been familiar with the writings of St. Luke themselves, or he may have been in close connexion with the Evangelist, or with those whose language was moulded by his influence. In any case the likeness of vocabulary and expression is not greater than that which exists between 1 Peter and the epistles of St. Paul. If, indeed, it were credible that the epistle was originally written in "Hebrew," then the external and internal evidence combined would justify the belief that the Greek text is due to St. Luke. If that

¹ Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 25.

opinion is out of the question, the historical evidence for St. Luke's connexion with the epistle is either destroyed or greatly weakened, and the internal evidence gives no valid result' (p. lxxvi).

We have here a full admission that the likeness of style and language to St. Luke is unquestionably remarkable. It is true that this conclusion is balanced in his mind by his inability to accept the idea of a literal translation of a Hebrew original. But, as we have seen, there is no need to suppose any such thing, but only an epistle which served as a basis for St. Luke's rendering. It is remarkable that the same impression of likeness to St. Luke was made upon another great scholar—we mean Delitsch. He says :

'To anyone who thoroughly studies the preceding Commentary, and is not content with a mere hasty perusal, it must appear more than probable that Luke had some kind of share in the composition of the Epistle to the Hebrews. In his Gospel, and also in the Acts, he adheres to the style of historical writing peculiar to the Old Testament, and especially to the Pentateuch—a style which, as I believe I have elsewhere shown, Matthew, the originator of the type of the Synoptical Gospels, first gave to their historical matter. In the Epistle to the Hebrews, on the contrary, he proceeds as independently as in the preamble of his Gospel, and in the second part of the Acts, where he appears speaking in person as the companion of Paul, more at least than in the first part. If due allowance be made for the fundamental difference in his mode of statement, which difference is the necessary result of the diversity of theme presented to him, and also for his dependence on older types and models, the surprising points of similarity between our epistle and Luke's writings, not only in wording and construction, but also in characteristic points of doctrine, will be rendered all the more conspicuous ; also the hypothesis on which we have proceeded, that the Gospel and the Acts form parts, as *πρῶτος* and *δεύτερος λόγος*, of one work by one author, will be the more completely vindicated. The testimony of Clement of Alexandria, the oldest and most important of all, is altogether confirmed in our view.'¹

If we accept the testimony of St. Clement, that the Epistle is a free rendering by St. Luke of what might have been a shorter epistle by St. Paul, we can easily see that this supposition fits into all the circumstances. Full scope is left for St. Luke's style and composition, and that which is probably the strongest argument against the Pauline authorship—we mean the mode of quotation from the Old Testament—is obviated. It would be natural for St. Luke to follow the Septuagint, even in cases where it differs from the Hebrew. It would also be natural for him to place himself

¹ *Epistle to the Hebrews*, vol. ii. p. 409, Clark's translation.

in the second generation of Christians, as he did in the preface to his Gospel. In fact, the sentence about the great salvation 'which at the first began to be spoken by the Lord, and was confirmed unto us by them that heard Him,'¹ is so exactly parallel to the 'things which are most surely believed amongst us,' which were delivered unto us by them 'which from the beginning were eyewitnesses and ministers of the word,'² that it serves as one of the many indications which point to St. Luke. But perhaps the greatest advantage of St. Clement's account is that it makes it possible for us to understand how the conflicting views of the East and of the West might originate. If we adopt it, it is plain that it might be said, with equal truth, that St. Paul is, and is not, the author. He is the author if he wrote the Epistle in its original form, and sanctioned the free rendering of St. Luke. He is not the author if we have regard only to the part which St. Luke had in it. Might it not be that the East got hold of the first aspect of the matter, and the West of the second? If the Epistle were written from Rome, the Romans might know of St. Luke's share in it, and thus be led to the statement that it is not Paul's.

There are also considerations of a more general nature which are of great moment for the decision of the question. Chief among these is the fact that the whole Epistle is pervaded by such a high tone of authority that it is impossible to ascribe it to any but an apostle of the first rank. This fact certainly excludes not only the independent authorship of St. Luke, but that of St. Clement of Rome, as also the conjecture of Luther, that it might be written by Apollos. St. Barnabas might have written it—that is to say, if he did not write the Epistle usually ascribed to him. But the view taken of the Old Testament in that Epistle, as has been pointed out by Bishop Westcott, is so different from that of the Epistle to the Hebrews that we cannot suppose that they came from the same author. There is also this difficulty in regard to St. Barnabas, that he did not stand to Timothy in the relation in which the Epistle places Timothy to the author. And this objection applies with equal force if we were to postulate as the author some unknown apostle of the circumcision—Andrew, for instance. In fact, this mention of Timothy compels us to look to the circle of St. Paul as that from which the Epistle emanated.

There is also this difficulty in the way of supposing as the author some unknown apostle of the circumcision. The

¹ Heb. ii. 3.

² St. Luke i. 1.

originality, the inspiration, and the reach of thought displayed in the Epistle are most remarkable, and at once place the author in the highest rank. If such endowments belonged to an otherwise unknown apostle, it is not conceivable that he could have remained unknown. He must, so we imagine, have been from the beginning a potent factor in the development of the Church.

We next come to the important question as to the main drift and object of the Epistle. And this is connected with, and partly dependent on, another: viz. what were the circumstances which called it forth, and which it was intended to meet? Unhappily we have no explicit account remaining of these circumstances, and all we can do is to gather together what we may infer from the contents of the Epistle, and what we know from the general situation at the time. There is much that is interesting on this subject in Bishop Westcott's paper on the characteristics of the Epistle. He lays down, as a basis for the Epistle, two difficulties or disappointments under which the Hebrew Church laboured. The first was the disappointment of the expectations of a speedy return of Christ, which had the effect of compelling them to accept, in a way they had not done before, the idea of a suffering Messiah. The sufferings of Christ could no longer be viewed as they had been at first, as a transient phase of His work, to be quickly forgotten in the glory that was to follow. They must be viewed as the essential part of His work. It was now necessary to accept nakedly the idea of a suffering Messiah. The second trial arose from the hostile attitude of the Jews. It had now become clear that the Jews, as a nation, would not accept Christ, and their alienation from Christians was getting more and more embittered. It was getting more and more difficult to combine the temple worship with faith in Christ; and, in point of fact, the right of temple worship was being withdrawn from those who believed in Christ.

We think Bishop Westcott has laid too much stress upon the first of these considerations, and not enough upon the last. A suffering Christ could not have been the difficulty here supposed, for the atoning death, as the central part of the Gospel, was laid deep as a foundation by the Lord Himself, as we find both from the synoptics and St. John; and it had been insisted on from the beginning in every document we possess. Then, in regard to the second point, we think the circumstances were more pointed and emphatic than is here supposed. We think that nothing less than a crisis had

arisen, and that this was brought about by the expulsion of Christians from the temple worship which had now begun. We can easily see how this would occasion a state of perplexity with which the Epistle seems calculated and intended to deal. Up to this time the Jewish Christians had not been separated from the worship of their fathers in the temple, but had regularly joined in it. Let us see what this fact implies. It implies that they had no clear idea of the relation in which the Old Covenant, with its sacrificial worship, stood to the New, inaugurated by Christ. In the case of many of them, it is probable the real order of the relation was reversed. They looked upon the old system as the chief and the permanent, and the Christian system as subordinate to it. Such views, so long as they were permitted to worship with the Jews, would remain latent and without practical effect. But the case would be very different when the Jewish authorities began to expel them. It is clear that this step would bring on a crisis. Christians would now have to choose between the two, and we can understand the perplexity and distress that would be thereby occasioned. It is clear, from the Epistle, that some were so weak in Christian faith as to apostatize, or be in danger of apostatizing, to the religion of their fathers. Many, too, who were stronger in faith, were yet in great perplexity and distress.

The whole structure of the Epistle shows that it was intended to meet such a state of things. Its leading feature is to show that the Christian is the perfect and final dispensation, and that the law and all that went before was but a shadow of it. Very grandly and majestically the Epistle opens. The Christian dispensation, the writer argues, is perfect and final, because, as compared with the old which was mediated by the prophets, it is mediated by God's own Son. He is greater than the angels, greater than Moses, greater than Joshua. Nay, He is greater than all; He is God's own Son, the brightness of the Father's glory, and the express image of His Person; He is the Creator and Upholder of all things. The dispensation, therefore, which He inaugurated must be complete and final. All this is argued from a general view; and then the writer comes to particulars. Here it is that his procedure merits our particular attention. What is the fundamental view or conception which he forms of the Christian dispensation? It certainly comes upon us with startling effect, accustomed as we are to the looser views of modern times. He regards Christianity as in its essence a system of Priesthood and Sacrifice. It is a perfect priesthood

and a perfect sacrifice, and as such was intended to take the place of all that existed before. The priesthood and sacrifices of the Jewish Church were but a shadow of this perfect priesthood and sacrifice, and even, as the author was writing, were ready to vanish away. We easily see how this great argument and revelation was calculated to meet the perplexities and anxieties we have spoken of as existing in the Church of Jerusalem. They might well be contented to go forth from the Jewish worship, considering that they had in the Priest and the Sacrifice of the New Covenant something infinitely better.

So far, there is no difference of opinion in regard to the meaning of the Epistle. But a divergence of view arises when we come to the mode of conceiving the priesthood and sacrifice of Christ. According to the old Protestant view, the sacrifice of Christ was ended on the Cross, or at least on His Ascension, when, as our High Priest, he entered into the true or heavenly tabernacle to make atonement for us. He now manifests Himself as King by sitting at the Right Hand of God. In regard to His Sacrifice, it is maintained, all that the Church on earth has to do is to believe in it as an act past and finished, to feed the soul upon it, to apply it by a living faith for the remission of our sins and the sustaining of the new life. On the other hand, the view taken in the Catholic Church is that the priesthood and sacrifice of Christ still exist, that the sacrifice slain upon the Cross was carried by the High Priest within the veil, where even now He is making atonement. Just as Christ is a Priest for ever, so His sacrifice is *eis τὸ διηνεκές*. The Catholic view further maintains that the sacrifice of Christ is embodied in the Eucharist, and that by partaking of it we have access into the holiest. The view is expressed by St. Augustine when speaking of participation of the Eucharistic Table, he says that what is there received is that 'which the Priest Himself, the Mediator of the New Testament, exhibits after the order of Melchizedek, of His own Body and Blood. For this sacrifice succeeded all those sacrifices of the Old Testament, which were immolated as a shadow of that to come.'¹ According to St. Augustine, therefore, the whole drift of the Epistle was to console the perplexed Hebrews for their exclusion from the temple worship by showing that they had in the Eucharist the perfect sacrifice.

If we look at the Protestant view, we see how imperfect would have been the consolation offered to the Hebrews if

¹ St. Aug. *De Civ. Dei*, xxi. 19, 20, p. 639.

we can suppose that this was the idea in the author's mind. Instead of pointing them to a Christian altar, he was in effect telling them that altars and sacrifices were things of the past; for, so far as the Church on earth is concerned, there is neither altar nor sacrifice. We shall presently consider how far such a view is reconcilable with the express teaching of the Epistle. Here we would only remark that, historically speaking, it is inconceivable that such a view could either have been propounded to the Hebrews or accepted by them. How did the Protestant idea arise? What were the genetic circumstances out of which it grew? Clearly it grew out of mediæval Christianity; and, as a tenet or system, it is quite inconceivable apart from mediæval Christianity. It has no meaning whatever; it has no substance or content except as a negation of the Roman Mass. It is therefore a pure anachronism to carry it back, as many do, and place it in the apostolic age. It will lead us to a more accurate and scientific view if we bear in mind that just as Protestantism grew out of mediæval Christianity, so Apostolic Christianity grew out of Judaism. Now, what from this point of view might we suppose the change would be in respect of priesthood and sacrifice? It would not be the abolition of them, but the substitution for the imperfect, of the perfect; and this, in effect, is the great result which the author of the Epistle sets himself to show.

The fundamental error in the Protestant view is a wrong conception in regard to sacrifice. What is it that we mean when we speak of a sacrifice? Do we mean the act or ceremony of immolation, or do we mean the victim offered? It is clear that, in the ordinary use of the word, we may mean either. The word sacrifice may be applied indifferently either to the ceremony or to the victim. Both of them may be called the sacrifice. But there is this to be observed by way of caution, that, according as we have the one of these meanings or the other in view, the affirmation will be different. What is true of the ceremony is not always true of the victim. In the case, indeed, of the Jewish and heathen sacrifices there was little danger of mistake, because, as a matter of fact, with the end of the ceremony the victim was destroyed and ceased to exist. But the case would be very different in respect of Christ when viewed as our Sacrifice. He did not, and could not, cease to exist. He liveth for evermore. The question, therefore, in regard to Him is: Did He after His death upon the Cross and ascension into Heaven cease to be our Sacrifice? The Protestant view,

18
re
ce
sa
Cr
vie
of
Ch
Sa
fic
i.e.
wh

ag
Me
con
hoc
mo
Hig
"W
of t
san
and
wor
mer
the
live
"By
(cha
holy
true
God

διη
hoo
som
self
that
Maje
(τῶν
Lord
Chris
heav
sacri
mini
trati
VO

refusing to understand by sacrifice anything else than the ceremony or act of immolation, affirms that He did. The sacrifice, it says, was completed, brought to an end, with the Cross and Ascension. Did the writer of the Epistle take this view? This is really the crucial point in the interpretation of the Epistle. Does the author of the Epistle contemplate Christ as being now at this moment both our Priest and our Sacrifice? Or does he imply that the priesthood and sacrifice were accomplished, finished, at a given point of time—*i.e.* at the Ascension? We think there can be no doubt whatever upon this point.

In regard to the priesthood of Christ, he not only affirms again and again that He is a Priest *for ever* after the order of Melchizedek, but he emphasizes it: 'This Man because He continueth ever hath an unchangeable (*ἀπαράβατον*) Priesthood' (chap. vii. 24). And then he affirms that now at this moment He is acting as our Priest. 'Having,' he says, 'an High Priest over the house of God' (chap. x. 21). And again, 'We have such an High Priest who is set on the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in the heavens, a minister of the sanctuary, and of the true tabernacle which the Lord pitched, and not man' (chap. viii. 1, 2). And then he specifies His work as High Priest: He intercedes for us, and makes atonement with His own Blood. 'He is able also to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by Him, seeing He ever liveth to make intercession for them' (chap. vii. 25). And 'By His own Blood He entered in once into the holy place' (chap. ix. 12). And again, 'Christ is not entered into the holy places made with hands, which are the figures of the true, but into heaven itself, *now* to appear in the presence of God for us' (chap. ix. 24).

And as the priesthood is for ever, so the sacrifice is *εἰς τὸ διηνεκές*. The sacrifice is indeed inseparable from the priesthood. If Christ is a Priest, 'it is of necessity that He have somewhat also to offer.' And that which He offers is 'Himself.' In the passage we have just quoted the author insists that Christ, when He was set down on the throne of the Majesty in the heavens, became 'a minister of the sanctuary (*τῶν ἁγίων λειτουργός*) and of the true tabernacle which the Lord pitched, and not man.' In the view of the author Christ at this moment is ministering as our High Priest in heaven. But the ministry of the tabernacle was a ministry of sacrifice, and therefore in his view Christ is at this moment ministering His sacrifice. If we recur to his favourite illustration of the day of atonement, though we must not press it

too far into detail, yet in a general way it yields this result : Christ the High Priest with the blood of His sacrifice is entered into the holy of holies, *i.e.* heaven itself. He is there at this moment making atonement, and we, His congregation, are waiting without. We are waiting till He comes forth, which will be at the second advent. Till that time the atonement goes on. Many of the Fathers, indeed, grounding on the words 'for ever,' thought that in some way it might not cease even then, but only enter upon a new phase. This idea we need not trouble ourselves about. It is enough to be sure that, in the view of the author, Christ as our High Priest is ministering His sacrifice in the sanctuary of heaven.

Bishop Westcott has said that the idea of Christ pleading His Passion, 'offering His Blood,' is a modern conception.¹ We think this assertion has been made on an imperfect induction. He has overlooked, for instance, St. Ambrose's words :

'The shadow in the law, the image in the Gospel, truth in the heavenly places. Before a lamb was offered, a calf too was offered. Now Christ is offered. But He is offered as a man, as capable of suffering ; and He offers Himself as a Priest, to forgive our sins ; here in image, there in truth, where He intercedeth for us an advocate with the Father.'²

Whether the idea is ancient or modern is of small importance ; the important thing is that it is imbedded in the Epistle. Instead, however, of speaking of it as 'pleading His Passion' or 'offering His Blood,' we should prefer to say simply 'ministering His sacrifice.' That that idea is in the Epistle there can be no doubt. The words of St. Ambrose, however, are suggestive, and they seem to warn us that Christ's work in heaven must not be pressed too literally. We are not, for instance, to suppose a literal material mercy-seat in heaven, and that Christ, like the high priest on the day of atonement, literally sprinkled it with His Blood. Rather, what the Epistle teaches is, that the reality in the heavens, so different are the conditions, transcends our comprehension. It can only be represented to us under a 'pattern.' Such a pattern was shown to Moses, and it is according to it, as carried out in the Jewish worship, that we are to conceive the work of Christ. As a pattern it is a true representation of the heavenly reality, but not an exact or literal copy. It serves as a shadow of the heavenly thing, and a shadow is all

¹ *Epist. to the Heb.* p. 230.

² St. Ambrose, *De Off.* i. 48. Quoted in Pusey, *Real Presence*, p. 456.

that we can understand. We know that Christ's sacrifice abideth, and that He is even now ministering it; but how He ministers it, in the heavenly reality, we cannot picture. If He embodied the mystery of His death in the Eucharist it may be that He is in some way manifested in the image of death before the Father. St. John saw in the midst of the throne a 'lamb as it had been slain.'¹ But whether this also was but an image of the reality we cannot say.

The next point to be determined is whether, in the view of the author of the Epistle, we have any means of sharing in Christ's abiding sacrifice. We have seen that, according to the Catholic view, which was the view of the whole Christian Church down to the Reformation, the sacrifice of Christ is embodied in the Eucharist. By partaking of the Eucharist we have, as it were, an entrance into the heavenly sanctuary; or, looking at it from another point of view, the heavenly mystery is in the Eucharist brought down to us mystically, so as to be the possession and life of the Church on earth. Is there any reason to suppose that this was the idea also of the author? It is plain that, if it were so, his argument and consolation of recompense for the perplexed Hebrews would be quite complete. He could in this case say to them, Do not grieve over the loss of the old sacrifices; we have even now a Perfect Priest and a Perfect Sacrifice. Our Priest is now within the veil making atonement; and we also in the Eucharistic mystery, which is the centre of our Christian worship, have an *εἰσόδος τῶν ἁγίων*. We have a *θυσιαστήριον* which is far better than theirs, an altar whereof they who expel you have no right to eat. Surely we can see that such an argument, as compared with one in which he practically said that altars, priests, and sacrifices are things of the past, would be far more effective and to the purpose. The question, however, is, Was this his mind and idea?

In order to answer this question we must go outside the Epistle. We must try to recall ideas and practices which then prevailed in the Christian community, and of which the minds both of the writer and the readers of the Epistle were full. We have to inquire in respect of the present point whether such an idea as that the sacrifice of Christ might be embodied in a mystery which should form the central act of Christian worship was part of the possession of the Church. Here, however, the difficulty is very great. We have been so long accustomed to a system of glossing by which the plainest statements and most pregnant indications are dissolved and

¹ Rev. v. 6.

explained away that, intellectually speaking, we have now got into a state of colour-blindness. Nevertheless we must make the attempt, and what we mean to do is simply to place the facts in their nakedness again before the mind.

Let us first recall the institution of the Holy Eucharist by our Blessed Lord. He took the Bread, He took the Cup, He gave thanks, He blessed, He gave to the disciples, saying, This is my Body which is given for you ; this is my Blood, the Blood of the new covenant. Do this for my memorial—*εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν*. Surely this was the institution of a great mystery ; and what else could it mean but the embodiment of His sacrifice ? He consecrates His Body in bread, and His Blood in the cup. The Blood separated from the Body, what could that mean but His death. Now, take the earliest commentary on this. We will quote from the Anaphora of the Liturgy of St. James, a document which in this part is most ancient, going back, in the opinion of skilled liturgiologists, quite into the apostolic age :—

‘ Taking bread in His holy and spotless and pure and immortal Hands, and looking up to Heaven, and showing it to Thee, His God and Father, He gave thanks and hallowed, and brake, and gave to us His apostles and disciples, saying :

‘ *The Deacons* : For the remission of sins and eternal life.

‘ *Priest (aloud)* : Take, eat. This is my Body, which is broken for you, and given for the remission of sins.

‘ *People* : Amen.

‘ *Then he takes the cup and saith,*

‘ Likewise also the cup after supper, having taken, and mixed it with wine and water, and having looked up to heaven, and displayed it to Thee, His God and Father, He gave thanks, and hallowed, and blessed, and filled with the Holy Ghost, and gave it to us, His disciples, saying :

‘ Drink ye all of this.

‘ This is my Blood of the New Testament, which for you and for many is shed and distributed for the remission of sins.

‘ *People* : Amen.

‘ *Priest* : Do this in remembrance of me. For as often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup ye set forth the Death of the Son of Man, and confess His resurrection, till He come.

‘ *Deacon* : We believe and confess.

‘ *People* : We set forth Thy Death, O Lord, and confess Thy resurrection.

‘ *Priest* : We therefore, also sinners, remembering His lifegiving passion, His salutary cross, His death, His resurrection from the dead on the third day, His ascension into heaven, and session on the right hand of Thee, His God and Father, and His glorious and terrible coming again, when He shall come with glory to judge the

quick and the dead, and to render to every man according to his works, offer to Thee, O Lord, this tremendous and unbloody sacrifice, beseeching Thee that Thou wouldest not deal with us after our sins, nor reward us according to our iniquities, but according to Thy gentleness and ineffable love, passing by and blotting out the handwriting that is against us, Thy supplicants, wouldest grant us Thy heavenly and eternal gifts, which eye hath not seen nor ear heard, neither hath it entered into the heart of man to conceive the things which Thou, O God, hast prepared for them that love Thee. And set not at nought Thy people, O Lord and Lover of Men, for me and for my sins. (*He repeats thrice.*) For Thy people and Thy Church supplicate Thee.

'People: Have mercy upon us Lord God, Father Almighty.

'Priest: Have mercy upon us, God Almighty.

'Have mercy upon us, God our Saviour.

'Have mercy upon us, O God, according to Thy great goodness, and send upon us, and upon these proposed gifts, Thy most Holy Ghost, . . . that coming upon them with His holy and good and gracious presence, He may hallow and make this bread the Holy Body of Thy Christ.

'People: Amen.

'Priest: And this cup the precious Blood of Thy Christ.

'People: Amen.'¹

Let anyone take this rendering of the Eucharist mystery, and then look at the allusions to it throughout the Epistles of St. Paul and other primitive documents, and he will be convinced, not only that this rendering of our Lord's act prevailed in the apostolic age, but that it formed the inmost, deepest thought of the Church—the centre of its life and worship. As a specimen of these allusions take Rom. xv. 16. St. Paul says, 'that I should be the minister (*λειτουργόν*) of Jesus Christ to the Gentiles, ministering (*ἰεουργοῦντα*) the Gospel of God, that the offering up of the Gentiles (*ἡ προσφορά τῶν ἐθνῶν*) might be acceptable (*εὐπρόδεκτος*) being sanctified by the Holy Ghost (*ἡγιασμένη ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ*).' The words are susceptible of two meanings. They might be taken literally, when they would mean that the Gentile converts of St. Paul were in the habit of offering a sacrifice which was acceptable, and which was sanctified by the Holy Ghost. Or, more probably, they might be taken metaphorically, as our translators have taken them, in which case the meaning would be that St. Paul regarded the Gentiles his converts as a kind of sacrifice which he was to offer to God, and that he laboured that this sacrifice might be made acceptable to God, being sanctified by the Holy Ghost. Let us take it in its

¹ *Translation of Prim. Liturgies*, Neale and Littledale, p. 49.

metaphorical sense, and then we have to enquire what was the ground of the metaphor. It is clear that it could only be this: He and the Romans to whom he was writing were well acquainted with a sacrifice which was acceptable to God and which was sanctified by the Holy Ghost. But such a sacrifice could only be the Eucharist, for the description applies to no other. Of neither the Jewish nor the heathen sacrifices could it be said that they were sanctified by the Holy Ghost. The words of St. Paul therefore imply, not only that the Eucharist is a sacrifice, but that in his time a liturgy was in existence substantially the same as the Liturgy of St. James. For this liturgy must have had a form of oblation immediately after the words of institution. This is implied by the terms *προσφορά* and *εὐπρόσδεκτος*. It must also, in immediate sequence, have had an epiklesis or invocation of the Holy Ghost to hallow and sanctify the sacrifice.

The Holy Eucharist was in the eyes of apostolic Christians an awful mystery—a mystery which embodied the sacrifice of Christ. And in this connexion we have also to bear in mind its central position as the great act of worship. We see, from repeated notices in the Acts of the Apostles, that it was the great service every first day of the week. But we cannot at this moment gather the evidence for it. We would only remark that there is a great resemblance between the evidence for the Scripture Canon and the evidence for the Eucharist. In proving the Canon we usually begin with St. Irenæus, Tertullian, and St. Clement of Alexandria, the period when Christian literature becomes comparatively abundant. We then reason back to apostolic times through the scantier relics that remain of earlier times. In like manner in regard to the Eucharist, if we begin with St. Irenæus, Tertullian, and St. Clement, we can not only establish a view of the Eucharist in every particular answering to the above extract from St. James, but we can by mentionings and allusions trace the existence in their day of every essential part of the Liturgy. Going back from them we have the important testimony of Justin Martyr, which we could have wished much to dwell upon. Very touching is the testimony of St. Ignatius. He not only bears witness to the Eucharist as a sacrifice, and that whereon it is celebrated as a *θυσιαστήριον* or altar, but he calls the Eucharist 'the medicine of immortality,' an expression which, when taken in connexion with the passage in his Epistle to the Romans, in which he expresses his longing for the Flesh of Christ, makes it certain that he applied to the Eucharist the sixth chapter of St. John—a circumstance decisive and

rem
con
in a
the
that
sacr

but
plac
cial
nate
that
and
our
stro
upon
least
state
ente
pass

imp
who
uses
from
pass
Euch
whic
and
loss
they
High

T
bold
the e
(the)
throu
Pries
is the
mind
passa
fect
we re
only
this

remarkable considering the many years he must have lived in constant intercourse with the Apostle. We would only notice in addition to this that St. Clement of Rome bears witness to the Eucharist as a sacrifice, giving as the function of presbyters that they are ordained to offer the gifts, *i.e.* the Eucharistic sacrifice.

This is but the merest outline of a vast body of evidence, but it may suffice for the present. It indicates what a high place the Eucharist held in the Apostolic Church, and especially in the circle of St. Paul, from which the Epistle emanated. Bearing it in mind we may ask: Is it conceivable that the author of the Epistle could discourse upon priesthood and sacrifice without reference to that great mystery? To our mind it is quite inconceivable. And this constitutes a strong reason why any allusions or indications which bear upon the Eucharistic mystery should have full effect. At least it is a reason against dissolving and explaining away statements which evidently have that bearing. We cannot enter into a full examination of this point; but there are two passages which we may notice as quite sufficient to establish it.

The first of these passages is Heb. x. 19. It is a most important one, because it must be acknowledged that the whole Epistle abuts upon it. Every argument that the writer uses leads up to it, and it is the great conclusion he draws from the whole. Hence if there is reason to suppose that this passage bears upon the Eucharist, we not only prove that the Eucharist was in his mind, but that it was the chief thing for which he was arguing. We prove, in fact, that the main drift and object of the Epistle was to console the Hebrews for the loss of the Jewish sacrifices by showing that in the Eucharist they had the Perfect Sacrifice and the ministry of the Great High Priest who is over the House of God.

The passage is as follows: 'Having, therefore, brethren, boldness to enter into the holiest (*εἰς τὴν εἰσόδον τῶν ἁγίων* for *the entrance into the sanctuary*) by the Blood of Jesus, by a (the) new and living way which He hath consecrated for us through the veil, that is to say His flesh, and having an High Priest over the House of God, let us draw near.' What, then, is the meaning which underlies this passage? Let us bear in mind that there are only two alternatives in exposition. The passage undoubtedly refers to the Perfect Priest and the Perfect Sacrifice; it is an exhortation to partake. If, therefore, we refuse the Catholic and primitive interpretation we have only the modern Protestant view to fall back upon. From this latter point of view it would be merely an exhortation to

feed the soul by faith upon a sacrifice past and finished. Is it conceivable, if this were the meaning, that the passage would have been so constructed? We cannot think so. We have first the entrance into the holiest; then the new and living way which Christ has instituted, the way of His flesh, which is a way through the veil; then we have the High Priest over the House of God; and, lastly, the exhortation, 'draw near with a true heart in full assurance of faith.' If it is merely an exhortation to believe in the sacrifice of the Cross, then all these particulars must be merely a pile of metaphors to express in different ways the nature of faith. But if so, why does he in the end separate the 'full assurance of faith,' not only from 'draw near,' but from all the metaphors which went before? And what intelligible connexion with faith in a past and finished act has 'having a High Priest over the House of God'? But the chief reason against this interpretation is, that if we adopt it, it is simply impossible to combine the particulars of the passage into any intelligible whole, as may be seen from the perplexities of the commentators.

On the other hand, if we accept the Eucharistic bearing of the passage, the whole becomes perfectly clear. In the idea of the Apostolic Church the Eucharist was mystically the entrance into the holiest, *i.e.* the heavenly sanctuary where Christ is, and which the writer had already indicated was now opened to all the faithful (Heb. ix. 8). It was also the new and living way which Christ instituted, the way of His [Eucharistic] Flesh; it was the way through the veil which screens off the heavenly sanctuary. And, lastly, it embodied the Perfect Sacrifice, in which the 'High Priest over the House of God' is the real celebrant. If it was the Eucharist which the writer had in his mind we see how appropriate it was to say 'draw near.' It is remarkable, too, as bearing on this interpretation, that the passage is followed by a series of Eucharistic allusions. We have four things laid down which may be considered as the necessary conditions of a right approach, *viz.* the true heart, faith, the cleansing of the conscience, baptism. 'With a true heart, in full assurance of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and our bodies washed with pure water.' Then we have an allusion to the recitation of the Creed. 'Let us hold fast the profession of our faith without wavering.' Next, we have an allusion to the kiss of peace, and to the offertory. 'Let us consider one another, to provoke unto love and to good works.' Lastly, the writer shows what was in his mind throughout the whole passage by alluding to their religious assemblies, *i.e.* assemblies for the celebration of

the
'N
ma
all
we

sho
el
to
Ch
fac
are
sho
the

give
el
crat
fore
tab
the
men
stan
sacr

hav
the
wh
'It
oug
Gra
it i
par
bec
the
fice
Gos
say
wh
tho
the
par
was
the

the Eucharist, for that was the chief service in those times. 'Not forsaking the assembling of ourselves together as the manner of some is.' We can understand how vividly all these allusions would be felt by the readers, accustomed as they were to the Eucharistic ritual.

That this interpretation is not an arbitrary one will be shown from this consideration. The leading idea is the *εἰσόδος τῶν ἁγίων*. We know how deeply this idea, as applied to the Eucharist, entered into the mind of the Apostolic Church. The whole ritual of the primitive liturgies is, in fact, grounded on it, and to this day the liturgies of the East are based on it. What kind of an idea it was will be best shown by another quotation from the Liturgy of St. James—the Prayer of the Veil, which belongs to the oldest part.

'We render thanks to Thee, Lord our God, for that Thou hast given us boldness to the entrance in of Thy holy places (*εἰς τὴν εἰσόδον τῶν ἁγίων σου*), the new and living way which Thou hast consecrated for us, through the Veil, the Flesh of Thy Christ. We therefore, to whom it hath been vouchsafed to enter into the place of the tabernacle of Thy glory, and to be within the Veil, and to behold the Holy of Holies, fall down before Thy goodness. Master, have mercy on us; since we are full of fear and dread, when about to stand before Thy holy altar, and to offer this fearful and unbloody sacrifice for our sins and the ignorances of Thy people.'

The second passage we alluded to is Heb. xiii. 10. 'We have an altar, whereof they have no right to eat which serve the tabernacle.' Let us first see the train of thought by which it is surrounded. The writer starts with the sentiment, 'It is a good thing that the heart be established.' But how ought it to be established? 'With grace, not with meats.' Grace is the heavenly gift of the Christian dispensation, and it is here set opposite to meats, by which we understand participation in the Jewish sacrifices. Meats are to be rejected because they do not profit. It had been the great object of the Epistle to show the unprofitableness of the Jewish sacrifices, and to set over against them the good things of the Gospel. He therefore, carrying out this thought, goes on to say: 'We have an altar, whereof they have no right to eat which serve the tabernacle.' This, again, brings up a further thought—the sore subject of separation from Judaism, which the writer had already treated at large. And now he has a parting word upon it. This separation, so painful to you, was really part of God's counsel, and was foreshadowed in the fact that the bodies of those beasts sacrificed for the Day

¹ Translation of the *Prim. Lit.*, Neale and Littledale, p. 46.

of Atonement were 'burned without the camp.' The fore-shadow was fulfilled when Jesus 'suffered without the gate.' So he concludes with an exhortation to them frankly to accept it. 'Let us go forth, therefore, unto Him without the camp bearing His reproach.'

The question is, What is meant by *θυσιαστήριον* in the above sentence? From the way in which it is set over against meats—*i.e.* the Jewish sacrifices—the obvious interpretation would be to take it as denoting the Eucharistic altar. But we see at once how pregnant this meaning would be in view of prevailing opinion. We see how much it implies in regard to Eucharistic doctrine. Hence it is not surprising that efforts have been made to escape from it. The term *θυσιαστήριον* has been interpreted metaphorically of the Cross, or, as some prefer, of Christ Himself. St. Thomas Aquinas so interpreted it, and his great authority has done much to determine the views of Roman commentators in the same direction. For obvious reasons the great body of Protestant commentators take the same view. Nevertheless, in our opinion, this view is quite untenable. Several years ago we showed in this Review that it is barred by the very construction of the sentence. The sentence is: 'We have an altar, whereof they have no right to eat which serve the tabernacle.' Now, if we take the altar as meaning either the Cross or Christ Himself, how could it be said that those who serve the tabernacle have no right to eat of it? What would be the meaning of eating off the altar of the Cross or off Christ viewed as an altar? Surely it would be believing in His atoning sacrifice, giving ourselves to Him, becoming His. But has not every human being the right to do this? If the writer in a previous part of the Epistle expressly said that Christ tasted death 'for every man,' how can we suppose that he would here contradict himself by excluding from the benefits of that death those who serve the tabernacle?

It is clear that we must understand *θυσιαστήριον* as something that was fenced about by conditions and restrictions; as something which was not open to everyone. And nothing answers to this description but the Eucharistic altar. It was an altar off which neither Jews nor heathen had a right to eat. Not even Christians had a right to approach it till they had gone through a course of preparatory discipline and been baptized. Is there any reason producible against the supposition that the author here calls the Eucharistic table an altar? We know of none except *a priori* prejudice. There is an idea that the Apostolic Church began in Protestant

sim
Pro
ind
exp
the
bef
he
of
the
'H
bra
whi
rou
sho
mat
sto
who
desi
Euc
him
sens

beca
of th
thin
or a
table
he s
Let

sacr
anyth
But I
to de
fellow
the c
of the

I
the p
set o
stron
Epist
Hebr
plain

simplicity, and that it took two hundred years before this Protestantism could change into Catholicism. Hence any indication to the contrary is regarded as improbable, and is explained away. But this presupposition does not answer to the facts. If we consider the whole purport of what has gone before in the Epistle, we see that it is not only natural that he should call the Eucharistic table an altar; it is almost of necessity. Surely if the Eucharist embodied, mystically, the Perfect Sacrifice, and if the real celebrant is the great 'High Priest over the House of God,' that whereon it is celebrated is not only an altar, but it is the only thing on earth which has a right to be called an altar. And all the surroundings of the writer make it extremely probable that he should call it so. We have seen how naturally, and as a matter of course, the Liturgy of St. James, re-echoing Apostolic times, calls it an altar. Then we have St. Ignatius, who was instructed and ordained by Apostles, repeatedly designating it so. We have St. Clement of Rome calling the Eucharist a sacrifice, which implies it; and we have St. Paul himself, in a metaphor, pointing to the Eucharist in the same sense.

But the case of St. Paul merits more particular attention because, if not directly at least indirectly, he was the author of the Epistle and responsible for its contents. Is there anything in the writings of St. Paul that would make it probable, or at least natural to suppose he would call the Eucharistic table an altar. There is the passage, 1 Cor. x. 18, in which he speaks of the Eucharistic table as *τραπέζα τοῦ Κυρίου*. Let us examine it, and see what result it yields.

The passage is as follows :

'Behold Israel after the flesh; are not they which eat of the sacrifices partakers of the altar? What say I then? that the idol is anything, or that which is offered in sacrifice to idols is anything? But I say that the things which the Gentiles sacrifice, they sacrifice to devils, and not to God; and I would not that ye should have fellowship with devils. Ye cannot drink the cup of the Lord, and the cup of devils; ye cannot be partakers of the Lord's Table and of the table of devils.'

It is observable that here we have the same contrast as in the passage in Hebrews. Here as there the Lord's Table is set over against the Jewish sacrifices. And this affords a strong reason against explaining away *θυσιαστήριον* in the Epistle to the Hebrews. If it can be explained away in the Hebrews it ought to be explained away also here. But it is plainly impossible to do so. In the passage to the Hebrews

it is just possible to take *θυσιαστήριον* as a metaphor for the Cross, and to take 'eating' as synonymous with faith. Here the *τραπέζα τοῦ Κυρίου* cannot be so dealt with. It must be taken as a material erection, and the cup which is drunk from it must, in its earthly aspect, be a cup which can be handled and applied to the lips. There was in the Apostolic Church a Eucharistic table from which communicants partook, and if the writer to the Hebrews calls it an altar that is no reason why we should suppose he is not speaking of it. But the most interesting question connected with the passage we have quoted above, is whether in the view of St. Paul the *τραπέζα* was not a true altar. We think there can be no doubt upon this point. It is put in contrast with the altar of the Jews, and the *τραπέζα* of the devils. No one doubts that both these were truly and properly altars. The Jewish altar is expressly so called by St. Paul; and, if he calls that of the devils a *τραπέζα*, he implies that it was an altar by indicating that sacrifice was eaten off it. Hence by implication that which is eaten and drunk off the Lord's Table is also sacrifice and the Lord's table is an altar. This is quite clear if we look at the idea which forms the basis of the contrast or comparison. According to this idea all the three celebrations—the Jewish, the Heathen, and the Christian—had this in common, that, by means of sacrifice offered and partaken of, they sought communion with an invisible power. The sacrifice which the Jew offered was in the idea of St. Paul an imperfect one, because it was 'after the flesh;' the sacrifice of the heathen was positively wicked and abominable, because it was offered to devils and brought about communion with devils. Only the sacrifice of the Christians was perfect, and brought about communion with God. Hence we see that in this passage St. Paul not only views the Eucharistic *τραπέζα* as a *θυσιαστήριον*, but he views that which is celebrated on it as a sacrifice; and this is of great importance in interpreting the passage in Hebrews. If St. Paul penned the passage, as is most probable (for the whole thirteenth chapter looks like part of the original Epistle), we see there is no reason why he should not call the Eucharistic table a *θυσιαστήριον*.

There is much more that might be said on this point; but we cannot pursue the subject farther. The Epistle to the Hebrews is one of the most momentous documents in the Canon. It is a simple historical fact (whatever view we may personally take of the Epistle) that it elevated the Eucharistic mystery, and fixed it for all time in the mind of the Church. What the Eucharist might have become without this grand

Epistle
that
the
of w
But
sch
tirel
who
be i
On
and
can
enti
Epis
ceed
belie
lay
man
tion
yiel
is g
und

AR

1. 7
2. 7
3. 7

THE
ausp
that
for c
Sund
conc
ratio
for m
there
Mr.

Epistle as a guide, it is impossible to say. Our only regret is that no Catholic scholar has in recent times made a study of the Epistle. Something has indeed been done by Mr. Sadler, of whose performance we shall give our estimate further on. But what is wanted is a Catholic treatise of the highest scholarship. As it is, the Epistle has been left almost entirely in the hands of Protestant theologians, or of those who are imperfectly imbued with Catholic principles. Far be it from us to depreciate the labours of these scholars. On the contrary we think them of the greatest importance, and essential to a complete understanding of the Epistle. It cannot, however, be denied that this leaves the exposition entirely one-sided. There is a whole side or aspect of the Epistle which has never been appreciated. Expositors proceeding upon an *a priori* view of what the writer must have believed and taught have been unable to see the facts which lay before them. The case of *Θυσιαστήριον* is only one of many others. There are in the Epistle a multitude of indications which, if carefully examined and pieced together, would yield a view of the Apostolic Church very different from what is generally supposed. All we can do is to commend this undertaking to our younger theologians.

ART. II.—RECENT WORKS ON THE GOSPELS.

1. *The First Three Gospels: their Original Relations.* By J. ESTLIN CARPENTER, M.A. (London, 1890.)
2. *The Composition of the Gospels: a Critical Inquiry.* By the Rev. ARTHUR WRIGHT, M.A. (London, 1890.)
3. *The Living Christ and the Four Gospels.* By R. W. DALE, LL.D. (London, 1890.)

THE work of Mr. Estlin Carpenter is published under the auspices of a Sunday School Association. We do not know that we can recommend it to the clergy in search of books for circulation either among the teachers or pupils of their Sunday Schools—and that not merely on account of the conclusions at which it arrives, but on account of the purely rationalistic character of its method. Sunday Schools exist for moral and spiritual ends. It does not seem to us that there is any more moral or spiritual help to be gained from Mr. Carpenter's criticism, unmixed and unilluminated as it is

by any positive religious teaching, than from Wolf's *Prolegomena to Homer*, or Bentley's *Dissertation on the Epistles of Phalaris*. It is only fair, however, to mention that the author holds out the expectation of a commentary on St. Luke, which will probably help his readers better than the present work to know what assistance for the human soul he believes to be derivable from the history of our Lord.

If the book is not useful for the Sunday School, it does not follow that it is useless for the study. In that point of view we have not met many works of late years which we should consider it more important for a Christian teacher who desires to be abreast of his time to master. It is full of well-digested learning, excellently arranged, and though to our thinking very one-sided, yet conspicuously honest and direct. And it treats of a subject as momentous as any which lie before Christian people at this day. To what purpose will the scholars of the Church have proved the early date of the Gospels, and refuted the theories of their origin which unbelieving schools have taught, if, after all, the characteristics of the Gospels themselves be so purely human as not only to deprive the books of all special authority, but to suggest the inevitable inference that the work and the Person of their subject are purely human too? This is the question which remains after dates and authorship have been considered, and we are grateful to Mr. Carpenter for the clearness with which he brings the issue before us.

His critical treatment of the Gospels themselves is what chiefly interests us in his book. We cannot profess agreement with his history of their reception in the Church. The testimony of Irenæus to the Four Gospels is not fitly represented without taking into account his exceptional access to the best sources of information; and it is really futile to say that the single instance in which he quotes the *Shepherd of Hermas* as Scripture invalidates the force of his hundreds of quotations from the canonical books. Nor is it the case that scholars are agreed in dating the *Shepherd* A.D. 140; for Dr. Salmon gives forcible reasons for placing it near the beginning of the century. And at all events the *Shepherd* is a Roman production, and Irenæus, while he has an immense respect for Rome, has no such means of judging about what concerns it as he has about Asia Minor and its traditions. A similar observation may be made upon Mr. Carpenter's attempt to undervalue Tertullian's testimony because of his acceptance of the Book of Enoch as a genuine relic of antediluvian times. The general testimony of our own age to the genuineness of

a work of Dryden or Pope would, as Dr. Salmon somewhere remarks, be decisive, even if the intervening testimonies had perished. Now, would the force of our general belief in a tradition thus close to our own times be weakened by any amount of credulity which one of us might show as to the Revelations of St. Bridget of Sweden or the Forged Decretals?

When Mr. Carpenter heads one of his paragraphs 'The Gospels before they were Scripture,' he proves himself to forget some very rational principles of these studies. The date at which a title or description is first used in the scanty remains of early Christian literature is not to be regarded as marking the time when the title or description was first introduced. Irenæus's imaginative proofs that there could not have been more or less than four Gospels is good evidence of a reverent regard for the Gospels long before his time. And so of the term Scripture. Those in whose works we find it are not likely to have been the first to apply it. Moreover, the non-use of the particular title is of small importance where other titles, having the same signification, are freely applied. We can scarcely suppose Mr. Carpenter to disregard the conclusive passage upon this subject in Bishop Lightfoot's fifth article upon *Supernatural Religion*. Papias is the writer who appears to Mr. Carpenter to 'treat the Evangelists' narratives as ordinary human literature' (p. 18); but Dr. Lightfoot shows beyond denial that the term 'oracles' used by Papias could be applied in his time coextensively with 'the Scriptures.' Mr. Carpenter will have to give much better proofs than he adduces if he expects us to believe that, in any sense more than a purely verbal one, there ever was a time when the Gospels were not Scripture.

But of all the introductory points which Mr. Carpenter treats, the Fourth Gospel is that upon which he is most unsatisfactory. If the ordinary English readers before whom he proposes to lay the results of recent study should come across Archdeacon Watkins's *Bampton Lectures*, they will discover some results of recent study of St. John which they will blame Mr. Carpenter for hiding from them. They will find that what he lays down as ascertained fact is only a struggling hypothesis. But the peculiarity of Mr. Carpenter's procedure is this, that he declines to discuss the date or authorship of the Fourth Gospel, and yet insists upon the unhistorical character of its contents. Now, it is impossible to separate the questions of date and trustworthiness in the case of the Fourth Gospel. Mr. Carpenter refuses to face the question whether Justin Martyr quotes the book, and yet

insists on his own right to believe that it is unauthentic. We are far from allowing that the production of this Gospel could be accounted for even if we were to place it in the middle of the second century. The psychological difficulty of supposing a mind so spiritual and yet so false will remain at any date whatever. But that which is unaccountable at any date becomes impossible at the early one. If you allow it possible that St. John wrote the book, the obvious tendency of it to illustrate a doctrine ceases to carry with it any tinge of the implication which Mr. Carpenter assumes—that the doctrine was invented by the writer. Whatever difficulties remain in harmonizing the style and incidents of the Gospel with the Synoptists become of comparatively slight importance if once we allow that St. John may be the author. For no method of accounting for his composing such a book can be so simple and satisfactory as that which teaches that its doctrine was the doctrine of St. John because it was that of the Lord Himself. The 'tendency' hypothesis becomes, if St. John be the author, a potent means of accounting for peculiarities instead of a reason for disbelief.

But why is it that Mr. Carpenter introduces St. John's Gospel into a book which is purely devoted to the Synoptists? Simply in order to provide a precedent for that falsification of the Lord's history which it is desired to ascribe to the Synoptists.

'The Fourth Gospel,' he says, 'deliberately desires to combine two widely separate ideas—that of the Jewish Messiah and the Greek Word. His purpose was clear, and the transformation which the figure of the Christ undergoes at his hand can be largely if not completely traced. But when we pass backward to the materials with which the Synoptists supply us, can we escape from similar inquiries? Are these stories, simple and artless as they so often seem, a genuine deposit of trustworthy tradition? Do they represent facts as they occurred? Or do they, too, betray the influence, conscious or unconscious, designed or accidental, of the ideas and feelings, the hopes, expectations, and beliefs of their narrators?' (p. 55).

Now, this parallel is futile if the late date of St. John be adopted. For an amount of invention might be easily possible in A.D. 150 which would not be possible in A.D. 70. On the other hand, if the early date of St. John is true, the argument for its untrustworthiness breaks down. Mr. Carpenter is in this dilemma, that if he places the Fourth Gospel late, no assaults upon it touch the Synoptists, and if he places it early its free handling of facts in subservience to doctrinal teaching become impossible to believe.

We cannot feel, therefore, that Mr. Carpenter's first two chapters afford any help whatever towards that estimate of the contents of the Synoptists on which he enters in the third. But, apart from particular defects, the introduction which to us would seem relevant and appropriate is of quite a different nature. We believe the proper preliminary inquiry is found in the question whether Christianity is or is not a revelation from God. In saying this we disclaim any desire to determine from the general notion of a revelation what amount of human error may exist in the books which record it. But to treat of the books as if we had in hand a literary question in which the ordinary human powers and motives alone are to be dealt with, is to determine against revelation. When Strauss or Renan begin by letting us know that the intervention of the supernatural in human affairs is an impossibility, they observe the just order. We know then with whom we have to deal; and when, in considering the details of the New Testament, they regard everything in a purely earthly light, we recognize that they are following out a system for which they have given reasons, whether sufficient or not. But Mr. Carpenter neglects the supernatural as a possible factor in the Gospels quite as systematically as any of those whom we call unbelievers, yet without ever telling us, as they do, why it is that he excludes it. This proceeding would be quite right in dealing with a book for which no supernatural claim was made, but the question of the Gospels is only of importance because it is part of the general question of Christianity; and Christianity is only of importance if it be supernatural. If our Lord had been thought of only as one of the human race submitting with patience on the common grounds of human duty to the universal lot, and nourishing faith in a God of whom He knew just so much as any of us might know, there would be no such religion as Christianity, and the Gospels would not be of sufficient importance to mankind to make it worth anyone's while to write a book about them. But, it will be said, how are we to know whether there was a revelation unless we first appraise the accuracy of the records which relate its appearance?

We reply that though the Gospels be a most important element in Christianity, they are neither primary nor indispensable conditions of its existence. Vast as the loss would be if they ceased to exist, Christianity would not vanish. Whatever reasons of faith are found in our belief that there is a God who loves His children and will help them; in our own desire for a Saviour; in the teachings and the hopes of the Old

Testament; in the life and writings of St. Paul and other doctors of the Apostolic Church; in the history and the witness of the Church throughout the centuries of her life—all these would remain if the Gospels were lost. And now that we have the Gospels all these independent reasons exist why we should not refuse to recognize supernatural influences in them as a possible account both of the nature of the record and of the things recorded. For instance, it will be impossible in reason that those passages in the Gospels which refer to the Messiahship of the Lord should appear in the same light to a man who believes that the hope of the Messiah among the Jews was the work of God and that Jesus was the Messiah, as to one who regards the hope of the Messiah as a mere historic fact in Jewish history, and its fulfilment in Jesus as an imagination without further truth than that which is found in the widespread belief of it. It is entirely in the latter point of view that Mr. Carpenter regards the Messianic idea. It is not easy to justify such an attitude consistently with belief in the Christian revelation in any sense at all. But at all events the point must be argued, not assumed.

The so-called results of criticism have obviously a disintegrating effect upon our conception of the rise of Christianity. They give us first the life of Jesus Christ Himself, beautiful but very simple and absolutely human. After that is past and gone for some years, Saul of Tarsus enters upon his work. He uses the name of Jesus, but his connexion with Jesus is a subjective creation of his own. Neither his spiritual impulses nor yet his mental beliefs are really derived from Jesus. The phenomena of the life and work of St. Paul are, upon this view, quite as isolated and independent as those of the Lord Himself. It is impossible to offer the history of Christ as in any way accounting for that of the Apostle to the Gentiles.

Then come the Synoptists. They contain, it seems, a view of the nature of the mission of Jesus which was never thought of by Jesus Himself. His claim to be the Messiah; His foresight of His death, with the purpose and effect of His death; His demand of faith and reverence for Himself; His representation of Himself as the coming judge of mankind—all these features in their conception of Him lacked justification in anything that He Himself taught or was. They are the invention of His followers, determined to glorify Him in spite of Himself, and the Synoptists give them expression. It is also worthy of remark that the Synoptists' picture of Jesus is as independent of any suggestion from St. Paul as of any original initiation in the acts or words of the Lord Himself.

A
St. J.
other
doctr
we a
deriv
perha
deper
and c
poun
mani
only
audac
Hims
No
porta
ages,
ments
But a
the G
any o
stitue
the n
vitali
idea v
more
eigh
prove
of the
thing.
If
the po
that, c
that t
more
would
Christ
remain
unlike
Lord t
the au
Christ
idea :
in hist
many

And then (to pass over the minor names of St. Peter and St. James which would nevertheless be great names in any other connexion), we come to the wonderful structure of doctrine which is given us under the name of St. John. This, we are to believe, is an absolutely new creation, neither deriving from St. Paul nor from the Synoptists, least of all perhaps from Jesus. The fundamental ideas upon which it depends were unknown to any of the three, and the events and discourses in which these ideas are exhibited and expounded are either wholly imaginary or so altered and manipulated as to be practically inventions. They are not only not the teaching of Jesus, but are in the most awful and audacious disagreement with everything that He believed about Himself.

Now, if these various views concerned matters of minor importance which hung on to Christianity as separable appendages, we might think of them only as remarkable developments, interesting to those who are curious in spiritual history. But although, as we have just now remarked in the case of the Gospels, we cannot say that the religion would vanish if any one of them were wanting, yet they are each and all constituent parts of that great and complex whole which, under the name of Christianity, has displayed such power and vitality in human history. The variety of character and of idea which they display only makes their essential unity the more astounding. It is not the reasonings of scholars, but eighteen centuries of Christian life and experience, which prove that the Christianity of Jesus, and of St. Paul, and of the Synoptists, and of St. John, make up together one thing.

If we were dealing with persons who refused to believe in the possibility of a revelation, we should still ask them to grant that, on the principle of refusing to multiply causes, it is likely that the various component parts of this great whole were more closely connected in their origin than recent criticism would lead us to believe; that the personal influence of Jesus Christ counted for more in the life of St. Paul than the scanty remains of the Apostle's writings directly tell; that it is most unlikely the Synoptists should have invented claims for the Lord to which His own words gave no foundation; and that if the author of the Fourth Gospel sets out a divine system with Christ at its head, Christ Himself must have given him the idea: otherwise you must recognize the spectacle, unexampled in history, of the independent appearance within a century of many minds each of which achieves a unique success in

spiritual teaching, while all of them, amidst the most striking individuality, fit together wonderfully into a living organism. The domination and impulse of one mind acting freely and nobly upon kindred spirits is, upon every rational principle, the likeliest account of the result.

Moreover, observe that the later we place the composition of the books of the New Testament, the closer do we approach to a period the literary remains of which, though scanty, are quite sufficient to show us what its powers of production were. The Apostolic Fathers and the Christian writers of the second century are well worthy of study. But everything that is ever said in their praise is said by the orthodox. The rationalists treat them with contempt, and certainly we must concede that they demand large allowance for the circumstances of the time, and for a primitive condition of thought, if we are to place them high among spiritual teachers. And yet it is in this mediocre period that we are to place the origin of book after book of the New Testament, which believers and unbelievers agree in setting at the very head of the spiritual literature of the world. These wonderful books are far from requiring any allowance for the primitive condition of their time. No time has been able to rival them. They rouse the reverence of every heart and mind, and that is equally a testimony to their power whether we conceive them to have learnt the natural secrets of the human heart, or to have moulded the human heart into their own image.

But perhaps we have to do with persons who recognize the possibility of a revelation and are willing to admit that the special action of God is a conceivable account of facts. In that case we would urge that if you separate St. Paul and the Synoptists and St. John from the direct influence of Jesus Christ and of each other, and leave them as inventors, each upon his own resources, you will then have before you so many separate records of spiritual teaching, each of which possesses no small claims to be a special revelation in itself. The Messianic and authoritative Jesus of the Synoptists, St. Paul's scheme of grace, the theology of St. John, mystical and practical—all these are such truly marvellous conceptions in their coherence and power, that we may well doubt the ability of unassisted man to produce them. They have proved their strength by the test of experiment upon an enormous scale, and the experiment has been carried on upon the supposition of their divine origin. None of these conceptions would possess the power to uplift human souls if they had been supposed to be based upon imaginations of men. We have

no choi
can be
latter c
interve
separat
as all c
troduce
continu
each a
more li
Indeed
includi
descrip
God m
assistan
apply t
Apostl
to four
blessin
The ch
founda
of ever
this cas
is but t
grace.
history

Th
of Chr
writers
in orde
believe
from t
Word.
which
Ghost
had ch
salvati
was co
bearing
of the
Ch
'The l
that b
inform
The L

no choice but either to surrender them, with any benefit they can be to us, or else to accept them as revelations. In the latter case we can either suppose them each in itself a new intervention of God, and crowd into a few years so many separate acts of the divine hand and spirit, or else regard them as all connected branches of one great system of revelation introduced into the world in the person of the Lord Jesus, and continuing its operations in His Apostles and other successors, each according to his place and power. And which is the more likely? The latter is at all events the Church's doctrine. Indeed, it has been the doctrine of all professing Christians, including Unitarians, until these later times. The general description of this great revelation is that of a presence of God manifested in a human life and death with such divine assistances as might enable men to take in its lessons and apply them. For this purpose the great Revealer chose His Apostles, trained and inspired them, and commissioned them to found a Church which should continue to participate His blessings and communicate them to others to the end of time. The choice of a body of friends and fellow-workers and the foundation of a society are the usual means by which teachers of every kind have striven to perpetuate their work. Only, in this case, the message is of so much higher a nature that what is but human influence in other instances becomes here divine grace. It is a glorified and sanctified instance of the usual history of the rise of a movement.

This is the way in which the entrance and early progress of Christianity are always viewed by the New Testament writers themselves. 'Many have taken in hand to set forth in order a declaration of those things which are most surely believed among us, even as they delivered them unto us which from the beginning were eye-witnesses and ministers of the Word.' 'Jesus began both to do and teach until the day in which He was received up after that He through the Holy Ghost had given commandment unto the apostles whom He had chosen.' 'How shall we escape if we neglect so great salvation, which having at the first been spoken by the Lord was confirmed unto us by them that heard Him? God also bearing them witness by signs and wonders and manifold gifts of the Holy Ghost, according to His own will.'

Chapter iii. of Mr. Carpenter's book has for its subject 'The Formation of the Gospel Tradition.' He rightly tells us that before the Gospels were written believers depended for information about our Lord upon the witness of the Church. The Lord Himself committed nothing to writing. The ministry

of the Apostles also was a 'ministry of the Word.' 'The written Gospel of the first period,' says Dr. Westcott, 'was the Old Testament interpreted by a vivid recollection of the Saviour's ministry.' But to enforce the argument that the Saviour's life was the fulfilment of Old Testament prophecy, it was necessary that His life should be known; otherwise, how could it be shown that it conformed to the prophecies? 'From this inevitable demand,' says Mr. Carpenter, 'a body of teaching about Jesus took its rise. The story of His life was shaped under this idea, for this was the outward principle on which the Church was founded.' Moreover, the practical needs of the life of the converted required rules of behaviour. 'What are the principles that should govern all behaviour? Plainly the principles of the Kingdom as laid down by the Teacher. So more and more stress came to be laid on the knowledge of the "laws of life" announced by Jesus. This knowledge could be drawn from one source only—the followers to whom He had imparted it. The first attempts to throw it into a shape in which it could be communicated to others must have proceeded from them.' And then came the transition to writing. No one can tell at what point of time this transition took place. But Mr. Carpenter thinks that probably a long time elapsed before it came. The age was not favourable to writing. The words of famous teachers were handed down in the Jewish schools from generation to generation. And so it is at the present day with the ancient hymns of India and the Koran of the Mohammedans, which are transmitted by memory for centuries. 'But these instances,' says the author, 'are not strictly parallel, for "the Christian tradition was no fixed deposit, no rigid or unalterable form. . . . Those who received and propagated it were no trained "repeaters"—they were gathered from the harbour, the market-place, the shop, and there was no guarantee that nothing should be added, changed, or dropped upon the way.'

'That this was the actual method of early Christian instruction,' proceeds Mr. Carpenter, 'is proved, for example, by the language of the Apostle Paul.' He himself names some incidents in the life of Christ. But much more may have been included in 'the form of teaching to which ye were delivered,' which he bids the Romans firmly retain in personal memory, or in the traditions which he bids the Corinthians hold fast.

This is Mr. Carpenter's view of the origin of the Gospel tradition. But though there is a great deal of truth in it, he gives a turn to the whole which essentially alters the character

of the
verte
taine
unde
Chris
and c
impe
in in
that
Chur
Apos
infor
the t
minu
first,
teach
Gosp
harbo
rema
condi
And
or ev
thoug
but p
Gosp
mere
word
was h
be ru
and I
this e
power
to pu
reme
the e
even
not h
who
mind
a trac
dispo
gradu
time,
and s
place

written
the Old
aviour's
aviour's
it was
w could
om this
teaching
ed under
Church
e of the
inciples
inciples of
ore and
laws of
e drawn
mparted
it could
n them.'
n tell at
But Mr.
efore it
e words
schools
present
n of the
enturies.
parallel,
rigid or
gated it
rom the
uarantee
upon the
tation in-
mple, by
es some
ay have
ere de-
personal
inthians
Gospel
in it, he
character

of the history. He represents the early Christians as converted to Christ's religion upon some impulse which contained little or no element of intellectual belief, and afterwards, under the pressure of the proved wants and experiences of Christian life, calling for some knowledge of the Lord's words and deeds, which was supplied to them by the help of very imperfect memories and of imaginations which felt no scruple in inventing what the occasion seemed to need. We believe that this is a wholly unwarranted conception of the Apostolic Church. Converts were made through sermons from the Apostles, which contained a distinct element of historical information about the Lord. And though, as was natural, the teaching of the short sermons and epistles we have is not minute, yet there is the best reason to think that from the first, mission sermons were followed up by careful historical teaching. This is plainly told us in the preface to St. Luke's Gospel. The first teachers were, it is true, taken from the harbour and the shop. But there is little relevancy in that remark unless it be implied that they were left in the same condition of mind which is implied by those employments. And it was not so: they were trained and inspired as apostles or evangelists. They were, perhaps, not trained repeaters; though Mr. Wright gives us reason to think that even this is but partially true. But if they were not it was because the Gospel of Christ is living truth, not to be propagated by mere verbal accuracy. But still they did use forms of sound words. And when they varied their forms it was because it was better they should be left to do so than risk of formalism be run. The examples of the exercise of memory in Jewish and Indian schools seem to us to be very relevant, because this exercise is not a fashion or fancy, but the exertion of a power which nature itself enables, and even compels, the mind to put forth when for any reason writing is not used. If the remembrance of the life of Christ was valued and taught in the early Church at all (and who can doubt it?) the teachers, even if no influence of the Spirit quickened their powers, could not help exercising a power of memory upon it, of which we who trust our records to writing and dismiss them from our minds have little notion. Therefore, where Mr. Carpenter sees a tradition gradually built up to meet a demand, we are more disposed to see a tradition which was richest at the first, gradually becoming impaired by the inevitable operation of time, yet well recoverable, under all the circumstances natural and supernatural, at the distance from the events at which he places the composition of our Gospels.

Here, for example, is an instance of Mr. Carpenter's application of his principle :—

'On the refusal of the Samaritans to receive Jesus and His disciples on their way to Jerusalem, James and John burst out in indignation (Luke ix. 54), "Lord wilt thou that we bid fire to come down from heaven to consume them?" The incident of Elijah (2 Kings i. 10) was no doubt in the writer's mind, though he did not expressly allude to it. But a later scribe recalled it to the attention of his readers by adding the words "even as Elijah did," and those were very widely copied. The story went on to relate that Jesus turned and rebuked them. "What did the Teacher say?" inquired some devout disciple, anxious to lose no profitable word. In due time an answer found its way into some MSS. "Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of." Yet this was not enough. The case was only a particular application of a general principle which a few versions of the story stated thus—"For the Son of Man came not to destroy men's lives, but to save them" (p. 69).

Now, how did Mr. Carpenter learn all this, of which he seems so perfectly sure? Who told him that the first quoted words were put down out of 'the writer's mind,' and not because they were remembered by some who handed them down to him as having been really spoken by the Lord? And how does he know that the next quoted words had not a similar origin, though they came through another memory? And how does he know that it was the demand of some devout disciple, and the necessity of supplying a general principle, that produced the other two clauses, and not rather the evidence of other streams of tradition which brought them down? We do not mean to deny that Mr. Carpenter's account may hold as to some readings, or even some portions of the accepted text, of the Gospels. But we offer the other theory as far more generally consonant with all that we know of the ways of the Apostolic Church, and far more likely to be generally true. On one supposition only does Mr. Carpenter seem to us entitled to assume the justice of his method: the supposition that Christianity is of human origin.

And this supposition is so very easily made, so level with our daily experience, and it finds so much in the human side of Christianity to support it, that accounts of phenomena founded upon it are sure to be plausible. And so, the process in which Mr. Carpenter supposes so many parts of the Christian tradition to have originated—namely, the easy transition from 'so it might have been' to 'so it was'—is the very process on which he relies for the acceptance of his accounts of the origin of many Gospel texts. He tells us, for

inst
of
wha
(co
syn
So
tha
int
of t
in t

of M
arri
to c
with
pita
a ce
of e
acc
and
into
earl
sing
sou
with
sho
mo
larg
nar
ope
by

fol
Me
eve
diff
Hin
con
bel
the
Chu
per
me
one
pag
Wo

instance, that 'there is reason to believe' the story of the cursing of the barren fig-tree to be 'a kind of translation into incident of what was in reality a parable of the fate of unbelieving Israel (comp. Luke xiii. 6-9), so that the tradition converted a story of symbolic meaning into the record of an actual occurrence.' So it might have been, no doubt; but it also might have been that the Lord Himself was the one who converted the parable into act. And this seems to us far the more likely account of the matter in the view of reason, and far the safer to accept in the view of faith.

'The Apostolic witness all centred round one great idea: Jesus of Nazareth was the Messiah. By what processes His followers had arrived at this conviction need not now be examined. It is sufficient to observe that the recollections of His words and deeds were suffused with the glow of feeling which this faith excited. All memory palpitated with emotion which could hardly fail to impart to imagination a certain quickening power. Under its stimulus the testimony even of eye-witnesses rose unconsciously to meet the high demand for a fit account of the Messiah's work. The magic of a wondrous personality and the ardour of new-born trust, affection, hope, lifted men's thoughts into an activity greater than they knew. All the enthusiasm of the early Church for Jesus was poured into the Gospel tradition. With singular elasticity it gathered up elements derived from various sources, but all penetrated with the same assurance, and pressed them with more or less completeness into the common mass. It has been shown how the presentment of Jesus as the Incarnate Word led to modifications of the Gospel story. These modifications were to a large extent conscious and intentional. In many of the Synoptic narratives a similar influence has been at work: but it has not operated so much by design as by the unsuspected changes wrought by time and faith' (p. 83).

We cannot allow that the question by what process the followers of Jesus arrived at the conviction that He was the Messiah, can rightly be avoided. Because it is obvious to everyone that a difference upon this point will impart a different complexion to the language they use concerning Him. If it was His own information that led them to the conclusion, and their faith in His word combined with their belief in Scripture to make them view Him as the fulfilment of the hopes of their race, then all the enthusiasm that the Church could spend upon Him was His simple due, and it is perfectly unnecessary to resort to the supposition that elements were derived from various sources and pressed into one mass. We are aware that Mr. Carpenter has in previous pages asserted that the presentment of Jesus as the Incarnate Word led to modifications of the Gospel story. But we

cannot remember that he proved it. And for our part we find it hard to say which of the two seems to us the greater spiritual impossibility: whether the author of the Fourth Gospel who, in a spirit of deepest devotion, falsifies the history of the most earnest preacher of simple truthfulness that the world has ever seen; or the Synoptist who performs the same process in perfect unconsciousness of what he is doing.

We find very little to render the view more easy of acceptance in the transformations of the story of Moses (always supposing that there were any such transformations) by the priests many centuries after his death, or in the dreamy though beautiful legends of Gautama, none of which can be brought into connexion with his time or his followers. How do these help us to accept the theory of a radical falsification of the life and claims of Jesus carried out in the face of His disciples at about the same distance from His time as we stand from that of Father Matthew, and palmed off upon a Church founded and taught by them—a falsification, moreover, which carries such lineaments of reality and truth as to have been the spring of moral progress to the most earnest and practical peoples of the world?

The stronghold of belief in the mythical origin of the Gospel history will always be found in the narratives of the miraculous birth of our Lord. They form the subject of Mr. Carpenter's fifth chapter. But we choose to take the statement of the case against them from Dr. Dale, who puts it in the mouth of a supposed objector:—

'Perhaps to some of you it may appear that these chapters, with their story of angelic appearances and of prophecies uttered by Zacharias, the father of John the Baptist, by Mary, the mother of our Lord, and by the aged Simeon, give a mythical character to all that part of the narrative. You may feel half-inclined to believe that though the rest of the Gospel may contain an early and authentic account of our Lord's history and training, these chapters must preserve the popular legends of a later generation or must have been the deliberate invention of a later writer.'¹

Dr. Dale's own reply is that the story of the birth and infancy are strikingly marked with a Jewish character, and show no trace whatever of having originated in a time when the conceptions of Christianity which followed upon our Lord's return to the Father had arisen. The observation seems to us just and forcible. Is it possible that if the narrative had been devised by some adoring disciple who had

¹ *The Living Christ and the Four Gospels*, p. 216.

learned to believe in a risen and ascended Lord, or if it had grown unconsciously and mysteriously out of the popular adoration which the faith of the Resurrection called out, there should have been such a consistent retrogression to the tone of Old Testament prophecy, and such a complete omission of New Testament ideas, as these inimitable canticles display?

But, after all, the potent reason for the clauses in our Creed, 'Conceived by the Holy Ghost, Born of the Virgin Mary,' must ever be that the fact comes down to us as an inseparable element in the Gospel tradition of the Apostolic time. Undoubtedly, if we are to weigh the separate parts of that tradition singly and individually, there will be some the evidence of which is greater than that of others. There is no complex historical incident of which the same may not be said. We are more sure of the death of Julius Cæsar in the Senate-House than we are of the circumstances which led up to the act. And in this sense we are more sure of the Resurrection of the Lord and of the general character of His divine life than we are of the particular incidents in the narratives of His birth. Cæsar might have come to the Senate-House by this way or by that, and the Lord might have entered upon His career by this way or by that. But in our acceptance of the whole event this distinction of its elements vanishes, and the certainty of the general whole makes it irrelevant to object to any but the vital and essential incidents. Now, we cannot pronounce in the abstract that an ordinary human origin for the Lord would necessarily have rendered impossible our belief in His Incarnation, or in His Messiahship and divine teaching, or in His Atonement, Resurrection, or Headship. But the miraculous birth is the particular method of entrance upon the work of salvation which has come down to us, and as such we receive it.

There is no competing story. It seems to us impossible that if any other idea of the Lord's earthly origin had obtained among the first Christians it would not have left some signs in the various literature of the New Testament. And the fitness of the accepted belief to the general tenor of the Gospel and the spiritual teaching of Christianity is sufficiently proved by the experience of eighteen centuries of the life of the Church.

We have traversed but a limited portion of Mr. Carpenter's book, but fully enough to bring into view the points in which his method appears to us defective. We should be sorry to leave the impression upon the minds of our readers that we are blind to the merits of the work. We began by advising

all who desire to keep abreast of the theology of the day to study it carefully, and we repeat the advice. It is a patent fact that the Gospels, like the rest of the Bible, have their human side, and that large play has been allowed in their composition to the common means and methods in which books are written. And therefore it cannot but be that a painstaking literary dissection of the Gospels should have a great deal to teach us. The rational examination of the Christian records of the second century has resulted in the victory of orthodox Christianity upon all essential points. It has put the composition of the three first Gospels back to the commencement of the last third of that century of which the Lord's life fills the first third, and has dated the most important portion of St. Paul's Epistles at the middle of the same century. It is certain that the same spirit of free criticism which has performed these services will have others as great to render in its treatment of the contents of the books themselves. Indeed, such results have already been largely gathered in. The commentaries of the great Cambridge school, with their introductions, have drawn out such a wealth of thought and spirit from the very letter of the New Testament as inevitably implies its inspiration.

But in every branch of life and knowledge we must sooner or later come face to face with the direct question of the supernatural. In every human life there is indeed a large portion to be accounted for on earthly principles, and in which earthly principles afford sufficient guidance. But if we ignore those facts, both outward and inward, which raise the question whether earthly relations cover all and account for all, we are shirking the question which, in the opinion both of earnest unbelievers and earnest believers, is the most necessary for man to ask and answer. In like manner science conducts us, by the methods of observation, over vast spaces of knowledge. But if she professes by her methods to expel spirit into nothingness she claims what she cannot effect.

Both in life and in thought there occurs a stage in which truthfulness absolutely demands that the question of the supernatural shall be faced and settled one way or other. Are we in contact with that which is spiritual and eternal, or only with that which is limited and transitory? This is a question which it is dishonest to set aside. We are taunted, and sometimes justly, with untruthfulness when we call in the supernatural to account for facts of which natural causes may be found; but the taunt is as well deserved when we occupy ourselves wholly in the range of material facts, and refuse to

contemplate those signs in conscience and religious instinct—those questions of the origin and guidance of the universe—which point to a power beyond.

Just so it is in the study of the rise of Christianity and of the Gospels. Criticism is the science which deals with the earthly side of this study. And it has much to teach us, as science everywhere has. But sooner or later we come to the question whether the supernatural is in the story at all or not. It is false dealing with ourselves and with it to escape from this question into the lower regions of material history, which, to be sure, exist in abundance for those who are satisfied to confine their thoughts to them. And it is peculiarly wrong for those who in a general way believe that the supernatural is in the story, to treat this momentous admission as if it had no reality in any particular case.

We have no doubt that Mr. Carpenter, in dwelling purely upon the critical side of the Gospels, conceives himself to be taking the truthful part; just as Hæckel or Clifford conceive themselves to be bound in honesty not to disturb their natural history with the idea of the supernatural. But in our belief he has passed the point at which such treatment is appropriate; and, unless he is prepared to follow the example which these authors set him in their own sphere, and deny the presence of the supernatural in the origin of Christianity, he must allow it a place, or show reason why he excludes it with a completeness which is scarcely matched by Renan or Strauss.

To our minds the conclusion of the whole matter is that it is impossible to treat completely of the origins of any essential element of Christianity without settling first the question whether God works in the world; and that this question is one which a man works out chiefly by the experiences of his own soul.

Mr. Wright's book upon the composition of the Gospels was briefly noticed in our last number; we need not repeat here the strictures which we made upon some incidental opinions expressed in it, nor our praises of its suggestive thoughtfulness. In truth, though small in size and moderate in price, it contains more matter, and that more important, than many a portly octavo. Had our differences with it been greater than they are, we should still have felt extreme gratitude to the author for representing to us the Apostolic Church as a living body, active in work and in thought, instead of a mysterious community ready to accept anything suggested to them in the way of the marvellous, and at the mercy of

teachers of whom you can scarcely say whether they rise to heights above or fall to depths below our modern notions of religion and truth. Here we do not find the Gospel tradition treated as the fruitful parent of any additions to the life of Christ which it may be thought desirable to suppose, while of its own origin it is thought unnecessary to treat. The deepest spiritual movement which the world has ever seen is not here presented to us as springing up without order or method, without reasons or principles. The Apostles, the Presbyters, the Evangelists and Catechists are displayed to us, not as abstractions of whose minds and ways we can have no understanding, but as living people consciously set upon doing something, and possessed of minds and methods which enable us to comprehend the results they obtained. Mr. Wright's work forms no bad supplement to that of Mr. Carpenter, and the two together will place the question of the Gospels well before the mind of the reader; the first stating the phenomena and the second showing how, in a living Church inspired by a living Spirit, the phenomena may have been brought about.

The name of Dr. Dale is sufficient guarantee that his book will be both able and effective. He is spokesman as well as teacher of a large and important class which is not so well represented in the Church, and we are therefore the more eager to see how he treats the great subject, and the more glad to welcome his aid. We rejoice to note the conclusion of so competent an observer that the confidence of the assailants of Christianity is 'not as firm as it was ten or fifteen years ago; for they are beginning to discover that renewed and prolonged assaults on the Christian faith—assaults from various quarters, and sustained with great intellectual vigour and with all the resources both of the older learning and the newer sciences—have produced very little effect.' This is precisely our own impression. The assault upon Christianity in the monthly Reviews seems to have fallen wholly into the hands of Professor Huxley; and he impresses us as caring a great deal more about displaying the metaphysical and critical studies for which he has found time in his scientific life, than about finding the truth concerning Christ. His style is no doubt very powerful in sarcasm not the best humoured; but it produces on us an unpleasant moral impression. And his efforts are generally directed to some unessential incident, such as the fate of the swine of Gadara, which he thinks it important to call pigs. Who can fail to

see that many explanations of such a point are possible, and that almost any explanation of it might be accepted without touching the faith? If we hear that very late in a campaign the best general of an army is directing his forces against an outpost, leaving the fortresses and the field to his enemies, we do not forebode victory for his side.

But we have digressed from Dr. Dale. The method of his excellent book is this. He begins with the spiritual experience of the devout soul. We feel and know that Christ gives peace and power. His name, through faith in His name, strengthens all that is good in us, and delivers us from evil. And when we open the Gospels we feel that the historic Christ there depicted is the same with whom our spiritual experience has brought us in contact.

Let us put it in this way: it is conceivable that we should have been brought to believe in the saving power of the Lord by preaching such as that by which St. Paul commenced his work among the unconverted, in which Christ's death for our sins and His resurrection to life for our salvation should have been the only historical facts relied on. How wondrously in harmony with such a faith should we have found the Gospel histories of the Lord's previous life when we afterwards came to hear of them! How impossible should we think it that so inimitable a character and story was the work of imagination or deceit! The highest literary power ever known might be challenged to prefix to the Pauline Gospel of the Death and Resurrection a fitting account of the Life. Yet the Evangelists have performed the feat. The Christ who lives and speaks in their pages is He who, now that He has passed beyond this world, forms the centre of Christian theology and the source of Christian feeling and thought. Therefore our own spiritual experience verifies the Gospel histories. Thus prepared, we come to consider the records of their acceptance in the Church, and the historical proofs of their authenticity.

All the doubts which have been raised about the Gospels have, as Dr. Dale well shows, failed to touch the practical certainty of the Christian faith for those who have received it. It will never be displaced in such persons, save by a substitute competent to perform the same spiritual services for their souls. But these doubts are capable of inflicting intense pain and of hindering the spread of the Gospel among those who have not yet experienced its power. Therefore Dr. Dale proceeds to state the evidence for the Gospels with much freshness, upon the plan which has approved itself to so many, both apologists and assailants, of beginning with

the period when they were universally acknowledged in the Church, and tracing the tradition back to its first appearance. We need not traverse the well-worn path. The reader may be assured that, though the gleaner after Lightfoot and Westcott, Salmon and Sanday, cannot hope to tell very much that is new, Dr. Dale has made the old story his own, and stated it with great power. His book will help to spread the true knowledge of the facts, and many whose patience would not carry them through a more systematic treatise will learn what needs to be known from these bright and interesting discourses.

There is one step in the argument—and, we think, only one—which would be stated with greater power by a Churchman. The first part of the book, in which the present claims of Christianity are stated, would be far stronger if the title of present possession were pleaded, not merely in the name of the individual experiences of religious men, but in that of the Catholic Church. Dr. Dale does not, indeed, suppose Christians to learn or hold their faith in mere isolation: he is too thoughtful to forget how brother clasps the hand of brother. But from the very first beginnings of the religion it has been the case that, in giving themselves to Christ, men have given themselves to the Church, which is His body. We believe that the earliest Christian converts felt the inevitable influence of the spirit of community, and said, 'We will go with you, for we have heard that God is with you.' The power of fellowship has ever been an essential element of conversion. And the authority of the community, sanctioned both by nature and by Christ, maintained the faith before the Gospels were written, presided at their composition, recommended them to the faithful, and imposed their use through all the ages in which they have existed. The Church of the First Days, as well as the Church of the Present, speaks to us in them, tells us what was the knowledge of her Lord which she derived from His own lips and His inspiring influence, and invites us to come with her to Him. Many a man whose personal feeling of Christian truth may not be so deep as to form that strong foundation for the Christian argument which Dr. Dale expects him to provide, may yet feel, in the glorious history and present life of the Church, that the story of Jesus has a hold upon the world which cannot be challenged without better cause shown than its critics have ever yet marshalled.

It w
comp
noble
of th
endu
and c
dutie
life.

T
and J
is to
bas a
drawi
author
has s
derive
identi
names
writte
the wo
if it w
betwe

But
which
pende
interc
thing
literat
Justin
more l

ART. III.—BISHOP LIGHTFOOT'S ST. CLEMENT OF ROME.

1. *The Apostolic Fathers.* Part I. St. Clement of Rome. A Revised Text, with Introductions, Notes, Dissertations, and Translations. By the late J. B. LIGHTFOOT, D.D., D.C.L., LL.D., Lord Bishop of Durham. 2 vols. (London, 1890.)
2. *Clementis Romani quæ dicuntur Epistolæ.* Recensuerunt et illustraverunt OSCAR DE GEBHARDT, ADOLFUS HARNACK. (Lipsiæ, 1876.)
3. *Clementis Romani Epistolæ.* Iterum edidit ADOLPHUS HILGENFELD. (Lipsiæ, 1876.)

IT will be long before the Church of England shall have completed the proud, sad task of gathering in the works of those noble sons whom one fatal year has taken from her. None of them surely will be of greater value than this grand and enduring monument of the labour which one great Bishop and doctor could add to the assiduous performance of the duties of a vast diocese—at the cost, we fear, of his own life.

To say that this great work, together with the *Ignatius* and *Polycarp*, completes an edition of the *Apostolic Fathers*, is to expel from that circle the well-known names of Barnabas and Hermas. Dr. Lightfoot offers decisive arguments for drawing a clear distinction between the position of these authors and the genuine Apostolic Fathers whose works he has so elaborately illustrated. The *Shepherd* of Hermas derives its supposed apostolicity only from the erroneous identification of him with the Christian whom St. Paul names in Rom. xvi. 14; and the Epistle of Barnabas, if written by the saint whose name it bears, deserves to be called the work of an Apostle rather than an Apostolic Father, while if it was not his work we have no proof of any connexion between its author and the Apostles.

But it may be doubted whether the grouping of the books which have borne the title *Apostolic Fathers* has really depended upon the question whether their authors had held intercourse with the Apostles or not. It was a convenient thing to possess in one or two volumes the whole genuine literature of the times between the New Testament and Justin Martyr. And on this principle we should think it more likely that the collection of so-called Apostolic Fathers

would be enlarged by the addition of the *Didachè* than reduced by the expulsion of Barnabas and Hermas. But it would be monstrous to expect that the whole should be edited upon the scale of Dr. Lightfoot's *Clement* and *Ignatius* by any mortal man. Even in the more restricted proportions of the edition of Gebhardt, Harnack, and Zahn those admirable scholars have each found ample employment in their several portions of the work. Bishop Lightfoot has edited the most genuine and important portion of what we may call the sub-apostolic canon. We may well see him leave to others the treatment of the antilegomena of the same collection, though we should not see our way to depriving these secondary compositions of their place under the general title. The essay upon the Epistle of Barnabas, which concludes the second volume of the work under review, may testify how close it stands to the *Apostolic Fathers*, even if by a very rigid definition we exclude it from the collection itself.

The contents of these volumes fall naturally into two divisions, the one of which concerns the personality of St. Clement and the critical study of the letters which bear his name, while the second regards the early history of the Roman Church. In fact, it might seem that the contents of the respective volumes might have been made to correspond to this obvious division of subject by transferring the dissertation upon the early Roman succession from the first volume to the second, and the epistles with their commentaries and translations from the second to the first, and placing the autotype facsimile of the Constantinople MS. at the end of vol. ii. as an appendix to the whole. We are far from urging this arrangement against the more competent judgments which have decided to intermingle the two subjects. But we are interested in maintaining the distinction, because it is only of the part which deals with the epistles and the author that we can treat at present. The history of the early Roman Church falls naturally to other articles, and our space will be amply occupied in giving some account of the exhaustive treatment which the Bishop bestows upon the other department of his theme. We do not pretend to glean the records after him. No one can hope to find many ears upon the field when that great wain has gone home with its load. We shall but follow and claim some voice in the use made of its contents. The method of the Bishop is indeed so thoroughly historical, that sometimes we should desire an excursion into the regions of theology or of speculation, which cannot but invite our view in the course of a journey so close to the sources of the faith. But in the history

whet
admi
enou
'Wh
A
conf
liter
have
saint
their
their
earth
enjoy
Was
the h
the c
wife,
tian c
bably
offere
Dr. L
probab
with
though
an in
identi
conso
and w
Cleme
a free
hold
An
only l
Churc
with i
the su
not of
which
names
tection
of his
Th
episcop
first ce
of Dor

whether of words and phrases or of events we must candidly admit at the outset that if anyone is learned or diligent enough to find anything additional to say it is not we. 'What can the man do that cometh after the king?'

A leaning has widely prevailed in ecclesiastical history to confound the bearers of similar names and reduce by a kind of literary Malthusianism the population of the past. Especially have historians and hagiologists delighted to identify great saints with nobles and princes, whether in order to enhance their merit in renouncing the world or to raise our respect for their memory by adding to their spiritual pre-eminence the earthly claims of rank and wealth. These tendencies have enjoyed more than usual excuse in the case of St. Clement. Was his not the name mentioned by St. Paul (Phil. iv. 3) with the happy addition that it is in the book of life? Was he not the consul Clement—kinsman and victim of Domitian—whose wife, Domitilla, was a Christian and the proprietor of a Christian cemetery, and whose slave Stephanus (himself not improbably a Christian) avenged his master's death and the insults offered to his master's widow by the murder of the tyrant? Dr. Lightfoot maintains, as it seems to us with the strongest probability, that Clement the bishop must not be confounded with either of these namesakes. Not with Paul's companion, though Origen makes them one; nor with the consul, though an impressive body of opinion in Germany accepts their identity. To our minds Dr. Lightfoot states a theory far more consonant with ascertained facts, with historic probabilities, and with the contents of the epistle when he conjectures 'that Clement, the Bishop of Rome, was a man of Jewish descent, a freedman or the son of a freedman, belonging to the household of Flavius Clemens, the emperor's cousin' (p. 61).

An existing link of connexion with the primitive Father, only less interesting than the cemetery of Domitilla, is the Church of San Clemente, so well known to visitors in Rome with its guardian and historian F. Mullooley. Upon this the suggestion is offered that the site was that of the house, not of Clement the bishop, but of Clement the consul, in which, however, if the bishop was the client of his noble namesake, he must have often met his flock under the protection of the great man during the lifetime of the latter or of his widow, Domitilla, after his murder.

Thus we localise our ancient author. The time of his episcopate was, roughly speaking, the last decade of the first century, and the epistle falls most naturally into the period of Domitian's persecution, A.D. 95 or 96.

It was occasioned by the unwelcome news which reached Rome from Corinth that a sedition had arisen in that Apostolic Church, and that certain presbyters of blameless character had been deprived of their office. We know how like things have happened in all ages of the Church, and how they may be done with a certain amount of sincerity in the name of religion. St. Clement's right to interfere in such a case was not personal nor even official, for neither claim is ever alluded to in his remonstrance. But Congregationalism did not prevail in those times, and no Church was independent of the rest; and a special right of judgment might doubtless be claimed by the representative of the great Church of Rome, whose very name carried with it all associations of authority. The Church of Rome ruled before ever the Popes ruled, and it was only by degrees, like a Napoleon, first servant of the Republic, then consul, and then emperor, that the Papal monarchy disengaged itself from its local origin and set up independent claims.

The letter of Clement, written in Greek, obtained its chief circulation among Greek-speaking Christians, and placed the name of its author upon an eminence which attracted to him the authors of spurious treatises in want of a name to recommend their forgeries, and the authors of fictions in want of a hero. Both these characters were united in the person of the writer of the *Clementine Homilies* and *Recognitions*, that strange example of religious novel before the days of Miss Yonge and Mrs. Ward. And this fiction was, as Bishop Lightfoot shows us, the grandparent of a still more memorable fabrication. We must give the genealogy in his own words.

'The "Letter to James," which is prefixed to the *Clementine Homilies*, was translated into Latin by Rufinus; somewhat later a second letter was forged as a companion to it; they were subsequently amplified and three others added to them, and these five Latin letters thus ascribed to Clement formed the basis of the collection of spurious Papal documents known as the *False Decretals*, the most portentous of mediæval forgeries, portentous alike in their character and their results. Thus the Clementine romance of the second century was the direct progenitor of the forged Papal letters of the ninth—a monstrous parent of a monstrous brood' (i. 102).

But the clustering of fiction around the name and story of Clement must not lead us to suppose that any just doubt can be entertained of the reality of his existence or the genuineness his letter. Ecclesiastical historians have for the most part recognized in Clement's case the principle that no accumulation of subsequent fiction round a name or event

should
nucle
rather
princi
been
Ignat
tainly
genui
The
Church
of the
he is
of cor
is ent
munic
abroad

The
comm
tempt
will b
able s
of a f
tempe
of Chr
by no
popul
teachi
parado
us nov
lecture
or hea
was w
knew

St.
of Rom
remem
which
those
impers
sojour
in Cor
is, how
remem
Christi
afforde

should have any influence in casting doubt upon an original nucleus of fact; rather the contrary, since it is round facts rather than fictions that fictions gather. But though this principle has been recognized in the case of Clement it has been largely forgotten in that of his younger contemporary Ignatius, in which the exposure of pretended letters certainly led to the exercise of unreasonable scepticism as to the genuine.

That the epistle owes its authorship to Clement, or to the Church of Rome through Clement, is the universal tradition of the second century, and is sometimes implied even where he is not named author, as in the *Shepherd*, where the duty of communicating the Divine message to foreign Churches is entrusted to Clement as the recognized channel of communication between the Church at Rome and the Church abroad.

The simple and artless structure of the epistle and its commonplace reiteration of obvious truth may move the contempt of an unreflecting reader. But a very different view will be taken by anyone who weighs the value of its admirable spirit of calm gentleness, though written from the midst of a fiery persecution and to readers of a fierce sectarian temper. We must remember that things which long centuries of Christian teaching have rendered commonplace to us were by no means commonplace to Churches gathered out of populations to whom, both in matter and manner, Christian teaching was an absolute novelty. We might say without paradox that the more commonplace the teaching appears to us now the greater novelty was it to them. Interesting lectures for the few were not wanting either to Jewish scribes or heathen philosophers; commonplace for common people was what they neither professed nor, if they had professed it, knew how to impart.

St. Clement's letter is written in the name of the Church of Rome, and his own does not occur in it. To anyone who remembers the emphatic personal claim of apostleship with which St. Paul commences his epistles, and especially those to this same Church of Corinth, the contrast of the impersonal commencement, 'The Church of God which sojourneth in Rome to the Church of God which sojourneth in Corinth,' is very suggestive. The first portion of the letter is, however, modelled upon those of St. Paul in its kindly remembrance of the graces which adorned the Corinthian Christians and the help which the fame of their virtues had afforded to the cause of Christ. An attractive picture of

primitive Church life is found in the words 'His sufferings were before your eyes. Thus a profound and rich peace was given to all, and an insatiable desire of doing good.' The transition to the necessary blame which the purpose of the letter required is effected, not without some simple art, in the quotation, 'All glory and enlargement was given unto you, and that was fulfilled which is written: *My beloved ate and drank and was enlarged, and waxed fat and kicked.*' Hence come jealousy, strife and sedition, persecution and tumult, war and captivity.' This opens the occasion for a long series of examples fortified by large quotations from the Old Testament to illustrate the vice of jealousy. But direct examples of the evil passion of jealousy are insensibly mingled with examples of virtue. First comes Cain; but then Jacob and Joseph, who suffered from the jealousy of others. And when the Gospel history is reached the introduction to it runs thus:—

'To pass from the examples of ancient days, let us come to those champions who lived very near to our time. Let us set before us the noble examples which belong to our generation. By reason of jealousy and envy the greatest and most righteous pillars of the Church were persecuted, and contended even unto death. Let us set before our eyes the good Apostles. There was Peter, who by reason of unrighteous jealousy endured not one or two but many labours, and thus having borne his testimony went to his appointed place of glory. By reason of jealousy and strife Paul by his example pointed out the prize of patient endurance. After that he had been seven times in bonds, had been driven into exile, had been stoned, had preached in the East and in the West, he won the noble renown which was the reward of his faith, having taught righteousness to the whole world and having reached the farthest bounds of the West' (ii. 273).

Dr. Lightfoot discerns in this passage, and especially in the tender phrase 'the good Apostles,' a mark of the personal intercourse of St. Clement with the great twin brethren, if we may call them so, of Christian Rome. The passage confirms the recognized tradition of the martyrdom of the two Apostles in the capital, and seems to show that St. Paul accomplished in the part of his life which the book of Acts leaves untold the intention to visit Spain, which he expresses in the Epistle to the Romans.

But here we shall make a remark the justice of which we must leave to the decision of students of the original. As we read this long catalogue of examples of saints, brought in somewhat awkwardly to illustrate the operation of a bad passion, we seem to be listening to the repetition of a stock

list of
epith
seem
extra
much
this
style
woul
wrote
that
way
tions
in wh
does
fact t
of ora
by or
Light
concl
early
epistl
trasts
addre
as pro
also i
46).
it app
which
assem
Su
of a w
the fo
'—Life
—Life
faith in
fall un
prepari
Father
and the
in the m
may be
dearly h
if we se
Him;
follow t
and ini

list of examples. We notice also the frequent accumulation of epithets, natural in speech, but too turgid for writing; and we seem to ourselves to be reading, if not a composition filled with extracts from homilies, at least the composition of a man very much accustomed to deliver homiletic addresses. We attribute this character of the writing more to the author's habitual style than to the fact that he must have known that his letter would be read in the assembly of the Corinthian Church, and wrote with the thought of an audience before him. We know that in point of fact the epistle was habitually read in this way at Corinth; but the same is true of many other compositions, including the Epistles of the New Testament themselves, in which this homiletic form is not to be discerned. But it does not seem unreasonable to give a certain weight to the fact that the epistle, while written by a man in the daily habit of oral address, was also intended to reach its destined object by oral delivery. It seems to us, therefore, that when Bishop Lightfoot writes (vol. ii. p. 104) that, while we have in the conclusion of the genuine epistle of St. Clement a specimen of early Eucharistic devotion, we possess in the so-called second epistle an example of the primitive homiletic address, he contrasts the two compositions too sharply. The method of address, 'brethren and sisters,' upon which he rightly relies as proving the homiletic character of the second epistle, occurs also in the first—at least so far as 'brethren' (cc. 37-41, 45, 46). We imagine ourselves to see in it—and increasingly as it approaches the end—a specimen of the kind of address which the Bishop of Rome was used to deliver in the Christian assembly.

Such an impression is founded on the general character of a work, and it is difficult to test it by extracts; but take the following:—

'How blessed and marvellous are the gifts of God, dearly beloved—Life in immortality, splendour in righteousness, truth in boldness, faith in confidence, temperance in sanctification! and all these things fall under our apprehension. What then, think ye, are the things preparing for those that patiently await Him? The Creator and Father of the ages, the All-Holy One Himself, knoweth their number and their beauty. Let us therefore contend that we may be found in the number of those that patiently await Him, to the end that we may be partakers of His promised gifts. But how shall this be, dearly beloved? If our mind be fixed, through faith, towards God; if we seek out those things which are well-pleasing and acceptable to Him; if we accomplish such things as beseem His faultless will, and follow the way of truth, casting off from ourselves all unrighteousness and iniquity, covetousness, strifes, malignities and deceits, whisper-

ings and backbitings, hatred of God, pride and arrogance, vain glory and inhospitality' (ii. 289).

The following will also serve to illustrate a trait to which Bishop Lightfoot justly calls attention, the strong sense which St. Clement displays of the reign of law in nature and the lessons which it conveys to human life :—

'The heavens are moved by His direction, and obey Him in peace. Day and night accomplish the course assigned to them by Him, without hindrance one to another. The sun and the moon and the dancing stars according to His appointment circle in harmony within the bounds assigned to them, without any swerving aside. The earth, bearing fruit in fulfilment of His will at her proper seasons, putteth forth the food that supplieth abundantly both men and beasts, and all living things which are thereupon, making no dissension, neither altering anything which He hath decreed. Moreover the inscrutable depths of the abysses and the unutterable statutes of the nether regions are constrained by the same ordinances. The basin of the boundless sea, gathered together by His workmanship *into its reservoirs*, passeth not the barriers with which it is surrounded ; but even as He ordereth it, so it doeth' (ii. 282).

The disciple of Newton or Darwin could scarcely convey with more eloquence his conviction that order reigns not only within our observation but beyond it.

No doubt it is a surprise to pass from passages like this to the illustration of the Resurrection derived by St. Clement from the fabled phoenix, which dies every five hundred years, but is reproduced from a worm which lives within its ashes. Dr. Lightfoot shows abundantly that this portentous invention in natural history was generally accepted at the time. But it is easy to waste our contempt upon the errors in fact which meet us so abundantly in the science of our ancestors. Mistake in particulars may be venial even in the view of science, where the general principle of order and law is well grasped ; but in the ethical and religious view it is certainly unimportant. Even so grotesque an illustration as the phoenix is the product of the great principle of analogy, which discerns the same law pervading religion and nature. Our Clement carries within him the conception of order which will urge him to constant search after genuine facts and causes according to the increase of his opportunities.

The principle of order observed in the material world becomes in St. Clement's thought a guide to us in the affairs of the Church. Our own Hooker can scarcely put the case more nobly.

'Forasmuch, then, as these things are manifest beforehand, and

we have
to do all
to perfo
ministrat
be done
where an
fixed by
according
They the
are accep
the Mas
proper se
office is a
are laid.
The Apo
Jesus Ch
and the
of God in
and havi
Jesus Ch
of the F
kingdom
and tow
them by
believe'

This co
impressi
lifetime
people v

The
high pri
manent
That wh
proved—
the prie
—is reje
more in
source o
feel by r
rejecting
orders t
and in t
analogy
of Corin
of a bish
Romans
ill we sh

we have searched into the depths of the Divine knowledge, we ought to do all things in order, as many as the Master hath commanded us to perform at their appointed seasons. Now the offerings and ministrations He commanded to be performed with care, and not to be done rashly or in disorder, but at fixed times and seasons. And where and by whom He would have them performed He Himself fixed by His supreme will: that all things being done with piety, according to His good pleasure, might be acceptable to His will. They therefore that make their offerings at the appointed seasons are acceptable and blessed; for while they follow the institutions of the Master they cannot go wrong. For unto the high priest his proper services have been assigned, and to the priests their proper office is appointed, and upon the Levites their proper ministrations are laid. The layman is bound by the layman's ordinances. . . . The Apostles received the Gospel for us from the Lord Jesus Christ; Jesus Christ was sent forth from God. So, then, Christ is from God, and the Apostles are from Christ. Both, therefore, came of the will of God in the appointed order. Having therefore received a charge, and having been fully assured through the resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ, and confirmed in the word of God through full assurance of the Holy Ghost, they went forth with the glad tidings that the kingdom of God should come. So preaching everywhere in country and town, they appointed their first-fruits, when they had proved them by the Spirit, to be bishops and deacons unto them that should believe' (ii. 292-3).

This contemporary of the Apostles, who writes under the impressions derived from St. Peter and St. Paul and during the lifetime of St. John, uses language strangely like that of the people we call High Churchmen at the present day.

The sentence above quoted which speaks of the duties of high priest, priests, and Levites as divinely ordered and permanent has given rise to somewhat various interpretations. That which Harnack and Gebhardt conceive Lipsius to have proved—viz. that the high priest stands for the Lord Himself, the priests for the presbyters, and the Levites for the deacons—is rejected by Dr. Lightfoot. And rightly; for what can be more improbable than to regard the Lord as at once the source of the command and a party commanded? But we feel by no means sure that Dr. Lightfoot is equally right in rejecting the obvious application of the threefold Jewish orders to those of the Christian bishop, priest, and deacon, and in taking refuge in the supposition of a merely general analogy. The absence of mention in this epistle of a bishop of Corinth is not more complete than the absence of mention of a bishop of Rome in the Epistle of St. Ignatius to the Romans. Yet the existence of Clement himself is proof how ill we should have argued if we had built upon that omission.

And even if we were, for argument's sake, to suppose that episcopacy had not yet been developed in Corinth, would it not be as likely that Clement should have before his mind the threefold ministry in his own Church as the twofold in that to which he was writing?

One of the most interesting questions which can be asked in respect of this relic of early Christianity, concerns its testimony to the New Testament. We find in it very strong language as to the inspiration of Holy Scripture. 'Ye have searched the Scriptures, which are true, which were given by the Holy Ghost; and ye know that nothing unrighteous or counterfeit is written in them;' 'ye know, and know well, the sacred Scriptures, dearly beloved, and ye have searched into the oracles of God' (cc. 45, 53). These expressions, however, refer to the Old Testament, with which, as Dr. Lightfoot remarks, the mind of the author was saturated (i. 59). He 'betrays no acquaintance with the Scriptures in their original tongue, but of the Septuagint version his knowledge is very thorough and intimate.' He is plainly one whose spiritual life and ministerial teaching live upon Scripture examples; and when he delivers a moral precept even of the most incontestable justice it seems to him bare and unsupported until he has fortified it with some Scriptural authority. But while Scripture is with him the Old Testament, it is, we think, only a habit of designation which prevents him from including the New Testament in the same category. Very close to the above-quoted ascriptions of inspiration to the Old Testament we find the writer exhorting his readers to 'take up the Epistle of the blessed Paul the Apostle: What wrote he first unto you in the beginning of the Gospel? Of a truth he charged you in the Spirit concerning himself and Cephas and Apollos' (c. 47). It will be remembered that the passages in 1 Cor. here alluded to (i. 12 and iv. 6) contain no special claim to be uttered by the Spirit, and that what is said of them might apparently be said of any other place in the writings of the Apostle.

Dr. Lightfoot claims for the three writers, whom he entitles by special right the Apostolic Fathers, that they are well within the stream of Catholic teaching upon the question of the Old Testament, and avoids alike the danger of Gnostic depreciation and Judaizing exaltation of it. And in respect of the New Testament they are a strong phalanx barring the way against the Tübingen theory of an opposition between the Twelve and St. Paul. We have already quoted the passage from St. Clement which couples the latter with St. Peter

as the
defini
pre-e
that
the A
tation
apocr
would
that
exact
whole
books
of the
remain

'T
more
Cleme
belong
literary
restrict
largely
to the
epistle
the typ
Epistle
Peter a
combin
trines o

Th
Gospe
Script
The q
longer
ment
differ
forwar
only r
the Ch
a life i
spoke
their li

But
the Ne
self is
determ

as the good Apostles. And though he does not recognize a defined canon of the New Testament he assigns special and pre-eminent authority to the Apostles, and his language, like that of Ignatius and Polycarp, is thoroughly leavened with the Apostolic diction. There is not a single evangelical quotation in his epistle which can be safely referred to any apocryphal source. Had the latter fact been otherwise it would have caused no surprise, but it is certainly remarkable that within the first century a writer should appear who so exactly represents the final decision of the Church upon the whole canon. If this absence of quotation from apocryphal books were observed in a writer whose allusions to the books of the genuine canon were few or limited, it would be the less remarkable; but the reverse is the case.

'The influence of St. Peter's First Epistle may be traced in more than one passage; while expressions scattered up and down Clement's letter recall the language of several of St. Paul's epistles, belonging to different epochs and representing different types in his literary career. Nor is the comprehensiveness of Clement's letter restricted to a recognition of these two leading Apostles. It is so largely interspersed with thoughts and expressions from the Epistle to the Hebrews that many ancient writers attributed this canonical epistle to Clement. Again, the writer shows himself conversant with the type of doctrine and modes of expression characteristic of the Epistle of St. James. Just as he co-ordinates the authority of St. Peter and St. Paul as leaders of the Church, so in like manner he combines the teaching of St. Paul and St. James on the great doctrines of salvation' (i. 95).

Thus, setting aside for the moment the question of the Gospels, there is no essential difference between the use of Scripture by St. Clement and the Catholic practice of to-day. The quotations from the Old Testament may be somewhat longer and more frequent, and those from the New Testament less numerous. But that is a mere circumstantial difference. The New Testament is less frequently brought forward, because the teaching and the practice which we can only reproduce for ourselves through its pages existed for the Christians of those times as daily experience. They lived a life in which the Lord and His Apostles, as it were, still spoke through their successors and the vivid tradition of their lives.

But when we have estimated St. Clement's testimony to the New Testament it occurs to us to enquire why he himself is not included in the sacred list. If the canon were determined by date this epistle would fall within it; for,

while the Neronian date is doubtless wrong, the true time of its composition, under Domitian, is earlier than that of the Gospel of St. John. If canonicity were a question of personal authority it would be hard to say why the Epistle to the Hebrews, of uncertain authorship, should be preferred to the genuine work of one whose name stands so high as that of Clement. Yet, says Bishop Lightfoot, 'there is no evidence that any respectable writer during the early centuries ever placed it in the same category or invested it with the same authority as the canonical books of Scripture' (i. 366). 'It had not even the same quasi-canonical place which was given to the *Shepherd* of Hermas in the West and to the Epistle of Barnabas in Alexandria and some Eastern Churches' (i. 369). It was read from time to time on Sundays in the Church of Corinth, to which it was addressed; and the practice extended thence to other Christian communities. But the significance of this would depend upon the question whether it was read as Scripture or as a homily.

We could have wished that our great Bishop had given us an exhaustive treatise upon the exclusion of the epistle from the New Testament, such as might have brought out in full the criteria and the meaning of canonical authority. But he does not leave us without at least one suggestive hint. The Apostolic Fathers, he says, 'present a marked contrast to the depth and clearness of conception with which the several Apostolic writers place before us different aspects of the Gospel, and by which their title to a special inspiration is vindicated' (i. 7). There cannot be a doubt that this is true. Although the literary merits of St. Clement are by no means small, and his purpose is clear, yet when we compare his thoughts and expressions with the tremendous spiritual force of New Testament writing, he falls far behind. The Word of God is quick and powerful and sharper than any two-edged sword. Clement's weapons are far less formidable, and he wields them with far less decision. An Old Testament quotation in the New is generally short, and often derives its meaning and force more from the use made of it than from its own original power—like a stone which some strong warrior breaks off to hurl—but Clement's long extracts very often seem to be protracted because his own thought, if it does not fail, yet at least does not press for utterance; they are signs of dependence, not of that adaptive power which turns everything to a purpose which is realized in overwhelming strength. Had Clement been included in the canon his letter would never have been a force felt and acknowledged

by the
nature
to use
is so
wheth
autho
But h
not a
who
Bisho
and e
light
jectio
The s
sweep
is gat
A
to ex
the ce
Testa
form
in cor
life of
good
the gr
into t
left a
or ori
Cleme
doctri
includ
In
by Ar
of St.
MS. h
the co
not or
even
with t
part o
in the
from t
points
edition
epistle

by the world as the true New Testament is. He takes his natural place rather among those who apply inspired writings to use, than among those who are themselves inspired. He is so good and so earnest that if he had claimed inspiration, whether formally or by the implication of a commanding and authoritative style, we should have hesitated to disbelieve him. But he makes no such claim. His very comprehensiveness is not a sign of inspired power, but the contrary. The writers who fill us with a sense of power divinely derived are, as Bishop Lightfoot truly intimates, those who take strongly and enforce with power some one leading view of truth and light up for us one side of life and thought. To pass by objections and qualifications is itself the sign of inspired power. The stream descends from the mountains with a force which sweeps past obstacles; but this is no longer required when it is gathered with its sister streams into the peaceful lake below.

Another reason which doubtless operated with the Church to exclude St. Clement from the canon was his distance from the central source of Christianity. All the books of the New Testament bear on the face of them this qualification in one form or other: that there is something in them that brings us in contact with the beginnings of the Gospel, whether in the life of the Lord Himself or in the first propagation of the good news. Even the Epistle to the Hebrews treats for us the great subject of the passage out of the old religion of God into the new, the omission of which from the Bible would have left a serious gap. But no one can say what primary question or original fact of the Christian religion is treated of by Clement, or what essential addition either to the moral or doctrinal riches of the New Testament would be made by including him in it.

In the year 1875 the Constantinopolitan MS. published by Archbishop Bryennios supplied a gap in the first epistle of St. Clement, which the loss of a leaf in the Alexandrian MS. had hitherto occasioned. It was then found that near the conclusion of the epistle the writer falls to prayer. And not only the general tenor and character of his petitions, but even many of their expressions correspond unmistakably with the great intercessory prayer which forms a conspicuous part of every ancient liturgy. Especially the model liturgy in the *Apostolical Constitutions* is plainly copied largely from this portion of St. Clement's epistle. Bishop Lightfoot points out that even before the publication of Bryennios's edition the number of liturgical expressions in the part of the epistle then known had impressed careful readers.

'All human life,' Dr. Lightfoot says, 'as truly conceived and as interpreted by the Church of Christ, is a great eucharistic service. It is not difficult to see how this one idea pervades all Clement's thoughts. Indeed, the proper understanding of the structure of the epistle is lost, if this key be mislaid. Our true relation to God is a constant interchange—God's magnificent gifts realized by us, our reciprocal offerings, however unworthy, presented to and accepted by Him. The eucharistic celebration of the Church is the outward embodiment and expression of this all-pervading lesson' (i. 391).

We venture to offer what we have before suggested upon the homiletic character of a large portion of the epistle, as helping to explain these Eucharistic references. What more natural than that Eucharistic views of the whole Christian life should pervade the homilies delivered at Eucharistic services; and when a bishop to whom the utterance of such homilies is a constant duty, ever within his thoughts, is called to give exhortation and correction by letter to another Church, what more natural than that they should take much of the form of the exhortation and correction which he is used to dispense to his own? And this prepares us in some degree for that which would otherwise be a very astonishing phenomenon, the occurrence of an Eucharistic prayer in the midst of a letter to a foreign Church. Bishop Lightfoot is, we believe, correct in ascribing this prayer to the time when the use of extemporaneous prayer at the Eucharist was settling down into a liturgy, when the proper topics of it were becoming recognized and its language invariable. But he offers no explanation of the appearance of the prayer in the epistle. Perhaps the explanation may be found in the association of prayer with the homiletic and Eucharistic language which he has been so largely using. The well-known passage in Justin Martyr¹ tells us, 'When the reader has ceased the president verbally instructs and exhorts to the imitation of these good things. Then we all rise together and pray, and when our prayer is ended bread and wine and water are brought, and the president in like manner offers prayers and thanksgivings.' Nor can we avoid believing that the writer expected his prayer to be used as such in the Church to which his epistle was addressed. How, in fact, do we suppose this prayer was read or listened to in the Corinthian Church, which, as we know, was constantly accustomed to use it? Would it be used as if it were addressed to the hearers, like the rest, or would it be offered and joined in as part of the Eucharistic prayers for the occasion on which it was read? We may explain the resemblance

¹ *Apol.* i. chs. lxxv.—lxxvii.

between
which
which
or e
Clem
still
to av
Corin
And
Corin
and t
fill in
for th
T
small
almo
arrest
little
Chris
we ou
we th
things
at thi
Savior
and th
and th
upon
the sa
of the
ment,
An ap
trinal
been
earnest
compe
Th
Eusebi
on its
seen it
¹ W
though
to remi
hopes of
² H.
doubt w
sceptica

between this prayer of St. Clement and the liturgical forms which have come down to us by the influence of his name, which produced an extensive adoption of his words of prayer; or else by the supposition that both the liturgies and St. Clement are using devotional materials derived from some still more ancient source. But either way it seems impossible to avoid the belief that his prayer was used as a prayer in the Corinthian Church, and not merely listened to as a sermon. And thus his letter would place him in the midst of the Corinthian Christians in the same character first of preacher and then of leader in prayer, which he was accustomed to fill in his church at Rome; the two congregations would be for the time being fused into one.

The so-called second epistle of St. Clement receives but small commendation from its editor; 'as a literary work it is almost worthless' (ii. 208). We wish we could say much in arrest of this severe judgment. The commencement of the little work is promising. 'Brethren, we ought to think of Jesus Christ as of God, as of the Judge of quick and dead. And we ought not to think mean things of our salvation;' ¹ for when we think mean things of Him we expect also to receive mean things.' These are prophetic words which show that already at this early period the writer knew that the nature of the Saviour was the vital subject of controversy in the Church, and that the maintenance of a sense of her own high hopes and the loftiness of her religious calling depended altogether upon her maintenance of His Deity. But we cannot assert that the same high level of thought is sustained throughout the rest of the composition, and after the fifteenth chapter the arrangement, as Harnack has observed, becomes extremely confused. An apocryphal Gospel also is quoted, and many of the doctrinal expressions are such as at a later period would have been viewed with just suspicion. Nevertheless the moral earnestness of the address is so conspicuous as to make large compensation for all these deficiencies.

The earliest mention we have of this production is in Eusebius,² and he calls it an epistle, though he throws doubt on its genuineness and it is not certain that he himself had seen it. And no doubt his mention of it as an epistle repre-

¹ We do not think this word should be printed with a capital, as though it were a personification. It seems to us that the writer means to remind us that in thinking meanly of Christ we think meanly of the hopes of the salvation which He gives.

² *H. E.* iii. 38. Harnack, in a foot note, would seem to allow that his doubt whether this be really the writing to which Eusebius alludes is too sceptical.

sents the title which had been always given it.¹ 'It is called an epistle from the first,' says Bishop Lightfoot. Nor was it in the power of the moderns to disprove the designation, seeing that fully two-fifths of the whole were wanting until the discovery of the Constantinopolitan MS. Shortly before that discovery Hilgenfeld had made the conjecture that the so-called second epistle of Clement was no other than the epistle from the Roman Church to the Corinthians, which Dionysius, Bishop of Corinth, as quoted by Eusebius, records to have been commonly read in Corinth. Bishop Lightfoot rejected this theory on its first appearance, on the ground that the epistle mentioned by Dionysius was from the Roman Church at large, whereas the author of the epistle speaks in the singular throughout. Perhaps this objection was not absolutely decisive, for the context of Dionysius's letter shows how entirely the action of the Roman Church and of their bishops was identified. And the example of the genuine epistle proves that a letter coming from a Church might often pass into direct personal address on the part of the bishop, who is the Church's mouthpiece.

However, all questions of this sort were put an end to by the publication of Bryennios's edition, in which the considerable portion of the so-called epistle hitherto missing was published, and the document proved to be a homily pure and simple. Hilgenfeld withdrew his hypothesis and substituted for it another which Bishop Lightfoot disproves, in our judgment, with far more decisive success than the former—that the second epistle of St. Clement of Rome is really a homily by Clement of Alexandria.

But it seems strange that our learned Bishop did not remember that the designation of this work as an epistle was not an error only of modern scholars, who knew but the fragment of it contained in the Alexandrian MS. They were taught the word by the primitive authorities, who, with the whole work before them, called it, as the Bishop himself allows, an epistle from the first. And the problem remains how this term could have been applied to a homily by writers who must be supposed to have known the difference between a sermon and a letter as well as ourselves.

It is with unfeigned diffidence that we suggest by way of solution to this difficulty the question whether, according to the

¹ Hilgenfeld's query (p. xlvii), 'Quis tandem ante Eusebium hanc "epistolam" memoravit?' seems to answer itself in view of the fact that Eusebius is a historian whose very business it is to record the language of those who went before him.

lang
both
from
We h
Clem
praye
likely
Churc

It
Churc
letters
Perha
gogue
to the
cap. 2
of Cor
the let
foreign
passag

'H
to thos
Church
struction
them to
respect
epistle
Marcion
Church
the Gno
place up
celibacy

It was,
should
should
the Cor

Dr.
livered
maintain
agrees v
say tha
appear t
do not p
the Cor
might w
same Ch

VOL. 2

language of the second century, a composition might not be both a homily and an epistle, if it was a homily despatched from some foreign Church to be read in a Christian assembly. We have seen how much there is in the genuine epistle of St. Clement which bears this character; and how a Eucharistic prayer, which is a part of a bishop's home service—still less likely than a sermon to form part of an epistle to a foreign Church—might yet be embodied in such a piece.

It seems to have been the custom of that time that Churches should welcome, and constantly read in the assembly, letters from foreign bishops full of plain-spoken admonition. Perhaps this was a continuation of the custom of the synagogue which invited from strangers any word of exhortation to the people. In the same chapter of Eusebius (lib. iv. cap. 23) which contains the communication from Dionysius of Corinth, describing the welcome which his Church gives to the letter from that of Rome, there is contained a long list of foreign Churches to which Dionysius himself wrote. The passage may thus be summarized :—

‘He extended his sacred labours not only to his own people but to those abroad in those catholic epistles which he wrote to various Churches, one of which was to the Lacedemonians, containing instructions in the orthodox faith; another to the Athenians, urging them to faith and to a life in accordance with the Gospel, in which respect he reproves the negligence of the Athenians. Another epistle of his to the Nicomedians is extant against the heresy of Marcion. He wrote another to the Gortynians and the rest of the Churches of Crete. In the same volume is contained an epistle to the Gnosians, in which he admonishes their bishop, Pinytus, not to place upon the neck of the disciples the heavy weight of compulsory celibacy.’

It was, therefore, plainly the custom of the time that bishops should write admonitions to other Churches, and that these should be received with gratitude. Might not the homily to the Corinthians have come to them in this way?

Dr. Lightfoot is of the opinion that it was a homily delivered in Corinth itself by some native ecclesiastic. Harnack maintains that it emanated from Rome, and the Bishop disagrees with the opinion of the German scholar; but we cannot say that the arguments by which he recommends his own appear to us decisive. The allusions to the Isthmian games do not prove much in view of the fact that St. Paul, writing to the Corinthians from Ephesus, uses similar images, which might well operate as suggestions to a future writer to the same Church. We do not see that a native would have been

more likely than a foreigner to mention (as the homily does) the landing of visitors to the games without naming the port at which they arrive. On the contrary, it would seem to be rather for natives than for strangers to designate the port of debarkation. And we must go on to say that when the preacher makes a moral allegory, and bids his hearers to resort to the games and contend, *καταπλεύσωμεν* does not seem to be the word which he would have used for 'resort,' if he had been writing upon the soil of the contest to people who had nothing to do but walk down and engage. We hardly suppose any compound of *πλεῖν* can have ever lost its original meaning so entirely as to be a natural expression to persons who have a short land journey in their minds, even when metaphorically used. But if it were so, what becomes of the argument that the port of arrival should have been named when it was said that strangers 'land' (*καταπλέουσιν*) for the games? Would it be natural to say to an English congregation that many foreigners 'land' for the Derby, and would it not be still more unnatural to proceed and urge these English themselves to 'land' for the Christian race? To our humble judgment there seem strong objections to supposing that a discourse so little remarkable in itself was either selected out of all the native homilies delivered at Corinth for preservation and for association with the honoured epistle of Clement, or that it was transmitted without authority from Rome, and received with such high honour in the Greek city. Surely the supposition of transmission by authority from Rome gives the most plausible account of the association of the piece with the epistle from the true Clement, which had formerly come from the same quarter, and at the same time of the term epistle, so universally applied to it in early times. It would ill become us to identify it with the epistle of the Roman Church in the time of Soter, when the learned author of that theory has himself withdrawn it. But, in spite of our respect for the great authorities who have refused to the little work the term epistle, since Bryennios revealed it as a homily, we feel some confidence in claiming the name for it still, in view of the fact that it was so called by the people of the second and third century, whose language Eusebius records, and by Pseudo-Justin and others in later times, all of whom possessed it in its integrity as we now do. The abruptness of the opening suggests the possibility that it may have originally been preceded by some introduction; but whether this were so or not the fact that, though a homily, it was from the first regarded as an epistle remains the same.

Bish
matt
and v
presu
schol
deser
instin
of the
the a
tact in
the in
with a
and h
overpo
scholar
not me
but be

One
and his
on eith
habits t
them in
Great i
between
of the m
poor an
wealthie
possesse
of the E
other pro
could po
education
Source o
inevitabl
other sep
ous cent
and dispu
munity o
degree th
as to its o
Their sac
form. T
None of

We have thus ventured to express our difference with Bishop Lightfoot on a few points. They are but minor matters, and even upon these it may well be that he is right and we wrong ; in the judgment of our own minds, antecedent presumption is all against us. We believe there never was a scholar whose thoroughness of work and balance of mind deserved more absolute confidence. There is a spiritual instinct in the studies which he pursued, answering to the use of the imagination in science, and a religious sympathy with the authors expounded, corresponding to common sense or tact in literary criticism. He possessed them both. He had the industry of the most laborious collector of authorities, with an intellect to master and marshal them each in its place, and he possessed powers of feeling and of soul that were never overpowered by his learning. He was one of those blessed scholars whose books will long benefit the reading world, not merely because he knew a great deal and thought correctly, but because he was good.

One cannot but wonder whether he has met his Ignatius and his Clement in Paradise. If so there will be little need on either side to forget or to unlearn any of the religious habits that were theirs in the Church militant, in order to place them in the most perfect sympathy in the Church triumphant. Great indeed were the contrasts in outward circumstances between the Roman bishop of the first century and the English of the nineteenth, the one a freedman and the minister of a poor and despised community, the other a peer of the wealthiest and proudest nobility in the world ; the one possessed of little science or literature, except the knowledge of the Bible and the tradition of Christ in His Church, the other provided abundantly with every resource that a scholar could possess, whether in opportunity of knowledge or in education to use it ; the one very near in time to the Divine Source of light and life, yet only upon the threshold of the inevitable developments of Christian thought and reflection, the other separated from Christ after the flesh by nineteen tumultuous centuries, but heir to the last results of all the enquiries and disputes of so long and active a period. And yet the community of mind between the two is larger by an infinite degree than all their differences. Their worship is the same as to its objects, and the same as to its means and expressions. Their sacraments are the same and practised in the same form. Their sources of truth and guidance are the same. None of those corruptions which have marred portions of

the Church's history had any hold upon either, though the reason of this in the one case was that they had not yet arisen, in the other that a painful process of reformation had torn them off. In respect of faith in God and in the Saviour, of the doctrine of the sacraments, and of tradition, and of the Bible, in value for Church order, and at the same time for evangelical fervour and personal piety, in simplicity of life, and zeal for the spread of the kingdom of Christ, there is really no difference between the two. They belong to the same type, and the same seal of the Holy Ghost is stamped upon them. They were linked together by the apostolical succession, by the organic life of the Church, and by access to the same heavenly grace; they cherished the same faith and the same hope, on the fruition of which they have both entered.

ART. IV.—PERPETUA.

The Acts of the Martyrdom of Perpetua and Felicitas; the original Greek text now first edited from a MS. in the Library of the Convent of the Holy Sepulchre at Jerusalem, by J. RENDEL HARRIS, formerly Fellow of Clare College, Cambridge, and now Professor of Biblical Languages and Literature in Haverford College: and SETH K. GIFFORD, Professor of Greek in Haverford College, Pennsylvania. (London, 1890.)

A LEGEND of the Apostle John (of no greater antiquity, it must be owned, than the fifth century) represents the aged Apostle as accused of unworthy trifling by a hunter, who had found him fondling a tame partridge, and as defending himself by the reply that the hunter's own bow if not sometimes unbent would lose its elasticity. But at the present day *neque semper arcum tendit Apollo* is a text on which it is not necessary to preach sermons. The general conviction of the necessity for occasional relaxation is quite as strong as anyone can desire. The poorest clerk, not content with the provision that Sir John Lubbock has made for his amusement, will stipulate with his master for two or three weeks total holiday, and would hear with incredulous scorn of the slavery to work of the prosperous linendraper a century ago, whose wife could complain to him that 'though wedded they had been these twice ten tedious years, yet they no holiday had seen.'

Nor is it only that a good slice of time is now required to

be for
large
The v
posed
by stu
would
In fac
object
be ma
has an
Greek
a grea
disting
own th
Bu
exercis
hard re
find co
life is a
years a
could c
to a frie
must ha
many n
read mo
reading
magazin
the read
dare say
in a day
plained
papers o
come in
and cons
tude, is
neither i
(one can
than gre
nearly tw
not only
of light li
has been
in its mar
which it i
accepted

h the
risen,
torn
our, of
of the
ne for
of life,
ere is
e same
d upon
ession,
e same
e same

be formally given up to relaxation ; amusement also claims a large share of the time that is supposed to be devoted to work. The vacations given at our schools and colleges might be supposed to be ample enough, but of the time spent in residence by students, taking them all round, the part devoted to study would bear a small proportion to that given to recreation. In fact a good case could be made for maintaining that the object for which a boy is sent to a great school is that he may be made a proficient in games, it being understood that if he has any surplus leisure he may employ some of it in learning Greek and Latin. Certainly a candidate for a mastership in a great school will be likely to find a record of high university distinctions insufficient to win him success, if he is obliged to own that he has no skill in out-of-door exercises.

as ; the
S. in the
at Jeru-
of Clare
cal Lan-
d SETH
College,

But there are young men who have no taste for out-of-door exercises, and who might with perfect truth be described as hard readers ; surely this is a class which we might expect to find consisting exclusively of the proverbial dull boys, whose life is all work and no play. But we remember that many years ago, on reading at what an early age Archbishop Ussher could claim to have read through all the Fathers, we remarked to a friend what an exceptionally hard reader the Archbishop must have been. 'Not so,' was the reply, 'at the present day many men and many women read more. Very possibly you read more yourself. Just count up the amount of your day's reading, beginning with a newspaper or two in the morning, magazine and review articles or other light literature, besides the reading that you designate by the name of study, and I dare say it will be found that you get through more reading in a day than ever the Archbishop did.' Bishop Butler complained of the evil effect of 'the great number of books and papers of amusement which, of one kind or another, daily come in one's way,' as occasioning our 'idle way of reading and considering things.' 'By this means time, even in solitude, is happily got rid of without the pain of attention ; neither is any part of it more put to the account of idleness (one can scarce forbear saying, is spent with less thought) than great part of that which is spent in reading.' In the nearly two centuries which have elapsed since Butler wrote, not only has there been an enormous increase in the supply of light literature which he thought so abundant, but there has been an equal increase in the amount of ability employed in its manufacture, and consequently in the consideration in which it is held. Time was when, in theory at least, it was accepted doctrine that none but the young and frivolous were

iquity, it
the aged
who had
ing him-
ometimes
day *neque*
not neces-
n of the
as anyone
provision
ment, will
al holiday,
y to work
wife could
een these
en.'
required to

habitual readers of works of fiction ; now grave statesmen and learned divines will not blush to acknowledge that it is their wont to unbend over a novel, if indeed the word unbend can properly be used of works which are often intended to influence public opinion on the most important religious and social questions. Household after household into which the entrance of a novel had long been strictly prohibited has been obliged to relax its rule on account of the great abundance and cheapness of such publications, and the consequent difficulty of preventing young people from reading them. Even religious societies such as the S.P.C.K. have no scruple in including works of fiction among the books they issue, and, recognizing the fact that the demand for light literature must be satisfied, think it enough to aim at providing such literature of a good and wholesome kind.

The fact is that it is now felt to be so impossible to dispense with light literature that people begin to inquire how former generations got on in this respect, and an article in the last number of the *Quarterly Review* undertakes to answer the question, What was the light reading of our ancestors ? But the truth is that, whatever may be said about light *reading*, no generation of men has dispensed with light literature. 'Tell me a story' is a request on the lips of every child, and the same cry has been heard and the same demand attempted to be satisfied from the earliest childhood of our race. Ballads and tales were in circulation long before the art of writing was invented, and the fact that many tales, substantially identical, form part of the folklore of nations which in historic times have had little or no intercourse with each other, gives probability to the opinion that some of the stories now told in our nurseries had their origin in those early days, before different tribes had branched off from the common stock.

If there are any after whose light literature there is need to make enquiry, it is the Christians of the Early Church. In the first days of our faith they must have felt little inclination for amusement. An intense seriousness was generated by their vivid conceptions of the unseen world, and by their persuasion that the day was probably close at hand when all the things in which the world employs itself, or takes pleasure, would be swept away by the coming of the Lord in judgment. And they lived in daily peril of their lives ; they knew not when they might be brought before the tribunal and be given the choice whether they would deny their Master, or suffer tortures—perhaps death—for confessing Him. But in time the pressure relaxed. No immediate ap-

pearance
were
for fro
tinued
the da
the wo
tion b
fainter
differin
around
ordina
engross
feel th
ment.
had en
ment o
condem
not but
indulge
particul
Christia
licentio
kind of
with pl
and ex
time so
advanta
assembl
lifted o
accounts

The
mediate
which th
ration w
of what
survivors
was a ca

¹ Yet e
some indir
that, while
comedy, th
before she
though the
most fright
is reasonab
general ser

pearance of the Son of Man was manifested, and Christians were tempted to cry 'Where is the promise of His coming? for from the day that the fathers fell asleep, all things continue as they were from the beginning of the creation.' Then the days of persecution passed over, and as the great men of the world became patrons of the Church, the line of separation between the Church and the world became fainter and fainter. A Christian was no longer one of a peculiar people, differing in habits of thought and mode of life from all around him; he took part with his neighbours in all the ordinary business of life; nor were his thoughts so wholly engrossed by hopes or fears for the future that he should not feel the common desire of men for relaxation and amusement. Yet the early training of the Christian community had engendered a Puritanic frame of mind as to the enjoyment of earthly pleasures. The more strict were inclined to condemn all such enjoyment as unlawful: the most lax could not but acknowledge that many things in which the heathen indulged without scruple were unbecoming a Christian. In particular the light literature of the heathen world repelled a Christian reader not only by its false theology, but by the licentiousness with which it was stained.¹ But there was one kind of literature which Christians of all kinds could read with pleasure, which supplied true stories more interesting and exciting than any fables of romance, and at the same time so edifying, that the greatest saint might study it with advantage, so that it was as fit for public reading in Church assemblies as for the closet reading of those who wished to be lifted out of the monotony of their daily life by hearing accounts of wonders or tales of heroism and adventure.

The elevation of Constantine to the imperial throne immediately succeeded one of the most violent persecutions to which the Church was ever subjected, so that the same generation which witnessed the rise of Christianity to the position of what may be called a State religion, had amongst it many survivors from the time when the profession of that religion was a capital offence, many who could show in their bodies

¹ Yet even in this respect Christian teaching seems to have exercised some indirect influence on the heathen world. Thus Dr. Mahaffy notes that, while in the plays of Terence, which represent to us the late Greek comedy, the lady whom the hero marries is almost always a mother before she is a bride, yet in the Greek romances of the Empire, licentious though they are, and though the chastity of the heroine is exposed to the most frightful perils, she always comes a virgin to her marriage bed. It is reasonable to think that it was Christian teaching that had raised the general sense of the seriousness of the loss of female purity.

scars and mutilations of which their testimony for the truth had been the cause. It was inevitable that soldiers returned victorious from the wars should be asked to tell of the battles in which they had received their wounds, and that they should be eagerly listened to when they went on to tell besides of the heroism of comrades who had given their lives in the fight, and whose bravery had gained for the Church the peace which she was then enjoying. Fortunately there lived at the time one able to fix these stories in a permanent form. Eusebius, who had a lively sense of the practical edification to be derived from the study of histories of martyrdom, was very diligent in the collection of such narratives. In his work on *The Martyrs of Palestine* he gave an account of the incidents of the Diocletian persecution in that part of the world which he knew best, and of which he could tell things that had either come under his own observation, or of which he might have heard from eye-witnesses. In his *Ecclesiastical History* he tells of incidents of the same persecution which had occurred in his own time in other parts of the world. And since that last most bitter persecution was only the turning-point of the conflict which the Church had been carrying on with the rulers of the State for more than two centuries, Christians would naturally delight to hear of the valiant acts of heroes who had contended for the faith in generations before their own. Ecclesiastical history has suffered a severe loss through the non-preservation of the collection of earlier martyrdoms which also Eusebius made, and which must have included some of the most interesting and most authentic records of the history of the Early Church.

It may seem strange that we should think any literature of this kind as fit to be classed under the head of light reading; but in truth, if works of history are to be put on one side, and works of fiction on the other, the line of separation between the two is not very distinctly marked. It had been always the custom with the greatest historians to ornament their narratives with speeches which none but very literal readers imagined to be an accurate report of words actually spoken, but in which it was recognized that the historian was at liberty to display his skill by giving adequate expression to the sentiments he attributed to the subjects of his story. So the Christian narrator of a martyrdom would not feel that he was doing anything that a historian is not entitled to do if he supplied the defects of his sources by giving on his own sole authority a report of questions put by the magistrate and answers made by the confessor, such as, in his judgment, were

like
exta
Tra
the
perc
guil
had
who
whic
that

I
strict
hims
speak
coun
fiction
went
and l
at.
bably
lated
the co
versit
says
mirac
religio
did no
they a
under
they a
them
though
this ex
we hav
acknow
with l
not lay
torical
it not,
but litt
draw a
in its d
picture
went th
in faith

likely to have been uttered at the trial. For example, the extant acts of the trial of Ignatius before the Emperor Trajan have no historic value ; in fact, the probability is that the martyr never came into personal contact with the Emperor ; but the martyrologist would no more feel himself guilty of falsification in giving details of an interview that he had no doubt had taken place, than other grave historians who have not scrupled to give picturesque details of events of which they knew no more for certain than the general fact that the event had happened.

But one who permits himself to deviate from the path of strict truthfulness cannot be sure how far he may ere long find himself to have wandered away. The literature of which we speak might for a time claim not to have forfeited its right to count as history, notwithstanding that it had borrowed from fiction some ornaments supposed to be legitimate ; yet as time went on, correspondence of the story with literal fact was less and less cared for, and edification came to be all that was aimed at. The principles on which the narrators acted, though probably never consciously stated to themselves, have been formulated and defended by Newman and by his fellow-labourers in the composition of the *Lives of the English Saints*. In his *University Sermon on The Theory of Developments*, p. 345, Newman says with respect to detailed accounts of martyrdoms, alleged miracles, or heroic acts, which are the spontaneous produce of religious feeling with imperfect knowledge : ' If the alleged facts did not occur they ought to have occurred (if I may so speak) ; they are such as might have occurred, and would have occurred, under circumstances ; and they belong to the parties to whom they are attributed, potentially, if not actually ; or the like of them did occur ; or occur to others similarly circumstanced, though not to these very persons.' The principles indicated in this extract were worked out in the *Lives of the Saints*, to which we have referred. Thus the writer of the *Life of St. Gundless*, acknowledging that much has been said of a number of saints with little historical foundation, and declaring that we may not lawfully despise or refuse a great gift and benefit—historical testimony—yet asks what are we to do when we have it not, when we have to deal with those who have left a name but little else besides. He contends that we are at liberty to draw a picture which will be a likeness on the whole, though in its details more or less the work of imagination. ' It is the picture of a saint who did other miracles if not these ; who went through sufferings, who wrought righteousness, who died in faith and peace—of this we are sure. We are not sure, if it

should so happen, of the when, the where, the why, and the whence.' And in another life, that of St. Neot, we are told :—

'Here are certain facts put before us, of the truth or falsehood of which we have no means of judging. We know the same things have happened frequently, both among the Jews and in the history of the Church, and, therefore, there is no *à priori* objection to them. On the other hand, we are all disposed to be story tellers ; it is next to impossible for tradition to keep facts together in their original form for any length of time, and in those days, at any rate, there was a strong poetical, as well as religious, feeling among the people. Therefore as the question, Were these things really so? cannot be answered, it is no use to ask it. What we should ask ourselves is, Have these things a meaning? Do they teach us anything? If they do, then, as far as we are concerned, it is no matter whether they are true or not as facts ; if they do not, then let them have all the sensible evidence of the events of yesterday and they are valueless.'

The principle laid down in this extract, viz. that the historic truth of a narrative is as nothing in comparison with its usefulness for purposes of edification, was freely acted on by the compilers of the histories of saints and martyrs, and the consequence has been that the word 'legend,' which perhaps, if edification only were regarded, might rightly have denoted the things most proper to be read, has come to denote things that must utterly be disregarded, not only by the critical historian, but by all who read with some higher purpose than amusement. Yet while it is true that valuable moral and religious lessons can be conveyed through the medium of works of fiction, it is equally true that a far more powerful impression is made by stories which the reader can feel relate what has really happened. If the narratives which we are discussing exercised extensive influence, it was because, whether true or not, they were generally believed to be true ; and the effect of a fictitious tale is proportional to the sense of reality which it can inspire, when we feel that the story is so natural that if the things related did not occur they easily might have occurred. This is, in fact, the apology we have just quoted for unauthenticated hagiology, that 'if the alleged facts did not occur they ought to have occurred ;' but when it is remembered that the alleged facts are for the most part accounts of miracles, it seems little less than profane that we should venture to pronounce what the Ruler of the Universe 'ought' to do. Unless we are wiser than He, we cannot rightly judge of His ways in any other way than by humbly seeking the best evidence obtainable as to what He has actually done.

It was, therefore, a valuable service that Ruinart proposed

to re-
tyrol
pred
those
The
have
that
much
is now
his co
doubt
puttin
better
We b
than
mode
docum
Ruina
to an
resear
cases
and th
such a
no me
antiqu
In
peculi
been o
practic
questi
accuse
of the
reason
tempo
made a
he has
trials,
and th
procee
once to
the cus
of such
remark

to render to the Church when he undertook to weed the martyrologies in which the mythical element had come largely to predominate, and to give in his *Acta Sincera* a collection of those histories whose authenticity might securely be relied on. The work was well done for the time, but it is only what might have been expected, that in the course of the two centuries that have elapsed since the publication of Ruinart's book so much light has been cast upon ancient documents that there is now need to do his work over again. He has admitted into his collection some Acts, the 'sincerity' of which is more than doubtful; in other cases new evidence has been discovered, putting the authenticity of certain Acts beyond question; or better texts have been obtained than those which Ruinart used. We believe that a scholar could not now do a more useful work than by bringing out a new Ruinart, brought up to satisfy modern requirements, in which the claims to admission of every document should be severely scrutinized, some of those which Ruinart had judged too leniently either omitted or relegated to an appendix, a few new documents added which recent research has brought to light, Greek texts given in some cases where Ruinart had been content with Latin translations, and the texts in all cases edited from the best authorities. If such a work could be put into a student's hands, he could find no more interesting introduction to his study of Christian antiquity.

In the discussion of Acts of Martyrdom one class deserves peculiar attention, viz. those which show marks of having been derived from the official records of the trial. It was the practice of the Roman tribunals to take down minutes of the questions put by the magistrate and the answers made by the accused. Such minutes might be purchased from the officers of the court by the friends of the martyr; and when we have reason to think we have these preserved to us we have contemporary evidence of the very highest value. Le Blant has made a comparative study of Acts of Martyrdom,¹ from which he has derived interesting results as to the routine at such trials, the series of questions ordinarily put by the magistrate, and the technical terms which recur in the official records of proceedings. We have thus criteria by which we are able at once to condemn some spurious Acts which show no trace of the customary formulæ, while on the other hand the presence of such formulæ is a note of genuineness, though, it must be remarked, not an absolutely decisive note, for it is not to

¹ *Mémoires de l'Institut : Académie des Inscriptions*, xxx. 57, 1883.

supposed that all forgers were unacquainted with the processes of the Roman tribunals or incapable of imitating them.¹

Although as a general rule later accounts of the life and death of martyrs, being chiefly written for purposes of edification, are far inferior in historic value to those which have the marks of having been based on heathen official records, yet two or three of the oldest and most valuable, which must hold a leading place in any collection of martyrdoms, are purely Christian in their composition. In the first rank would come the letter of the Church of Smyrna relating the martyrdom of Polycarp, which apparently stood first in the collection of martyrdoms made by Eusebius.² It is given by Ruinart only in Latin, but a new editor would be able to use Lightfoot's edition of the Greek, and would also derive valuable assistance from the discussion of other early martyrdoms given by Lightfoot in the same work. That we have here the story of the death of Polycarp as related by eyewitnesses there can be no reasonable doubt. Second in interest and importance we would place the account of the persecution of the year 177 as it was experienced in Gaul, related in the letter of the Churches of Vienne and Lyons, from which Eusebius has given large extracts in the beginning of the fifth book of his history. We have to mourn the loss of his collection of martyrdoms in which this document was given entire, for the omissions made by Eusebius in his history leave some points doubtful on which we would gladly have fuller information; and indeed this is such a precious monument of Christian antiquity that we must grieve that it has suffered any mutilation. For in this case, as in that of the martyrdom of Polycarp, we have not a story of the past written for the edification of posterity, but a contemporary letter written to inform friends at a distance of things which the writers had witnessed. It cannot be said that there is any undue wish to exalt the heroism of the sufferers, though the

¹ In the case of the martyr who is the subject of this article we have an illustration how the form of the official record came to be regarded as that proper for the narrative of a martyrdom. A shorter form of the *Acts of Perpetua* was published by Aubé from MSS. in the National Library at Paris. An examination of it shows that it has no historic value, and is merely an abridged version of the genuine Acts, made to appear as if it was founded on official minutes, and with a few additions due to the imagination of the compiler. We cannot help suspecting that the extant *Acts of Justin Martyr* have the same relation to lost genuine Acts that Aubé's version of the *Acts of Perpetua* bears to the true.

² So Lightfoot (*Ignatius*, i. 608), though we must own ourselves not satisfied by his argument.

writers speak of them with the gratitude and admiration which the sight of their constancy would naturally inspire.

The third place we consider is fairly due to the story of the African martyrdoms at the very beginning of the third century,¹ on which a new and unexpected light has been cast by the publication of Messrs. Harris and Gifford, the title of which we have prefixed to this article. Indeed it is only on chronological grounds that we are obliged to place this story third, for these acts contain one feature of still higher interest than the other two we have named. In the latter we have the story of the martyrs as told by eyewitnesses; we might indeed have had a letter written in prison by the martyrs themselves, but unfortunately Eusebius, who was in possession of the letter, has not included it in his history. But in this case we have preserved the prison thoughts of two of the sufferers, written down in their own words. The result is that in this document we have unequalled means of understanding how Christians at the time felt and lived.

But here a question arises whether the sufferers were members of the Catholic Church, or schismatics, not to say heretics. The prison diaries to which we refer are a record of visions and revelations, and it was precisely because they had such visions to record that the writers thought them worthy of preservation. And the original editor of the Acts has prefixed a preface in which these visions are set forth as deserving the highest regard. The writer remarks that the same reasons which caused ancient examples of faith to be recorded for the edification of the Church justify also the recording of what took place in his own time; what was then recent, would one day be ancient; and it is the same Spirit who works in all ages of the Church, nay, more abundantly in the 'last days' of the Church, those days of which Joel foretold, 'your sons and your daughters shall prophesy, and I will pour out my spirit upon my servants and my handmaidens, and your young men shall see visions, and your old men shall dream dreams.' It is notorious that in the early part of the third century Montanism, the peculiarities of which were entirely founded on visions and revelations, found many adherents in Africa, where it had an able advocate in Tertullian. Accordingly Valois pronounced our Acts to be Montanist, and it has been conjectured that Tertullian himself may have been their editor; but this idea may be rejected, for Tertullian in referring (*De Anima*) to the story, is guilty of a lapse of memory, very unlikely to have taken place if he had been the

¹ We acquiesce in the year 203 as the most probable date.

writer of the story.¹ The present editor, Mr. Harris, whose Quakerism² inspires him with strong sympathies with Montanism, which he appears to regard as the primitive form of Christianity suppressed by undue exercise of ecclesiastical authority, believes in the Montanism of our Acts. But it may be said with certainty that they are not Montanist in any schismatical sense of the word. What is decisive is that these Acts which were evidently composed with a view to their being used in Church reading, were so used from the first. In the time of St. Augustine the feast of St. Perpetua was kept, and these Acts read, as can be abundantly proved from his extant sermons, preached on that day in three different years. It is evident that after the formal separation had taken place in Africa between the Montanists and the Catholics, no writing composed in the former community would have been admitted into the Church reading of the latter. How little likely the Church was to do honour to the Acts of a Montanist martyr, may be gathered from the fact (Euseb. v. 15) that when Catholics and Montanists were fellow-sufferers in the same persecution, the former martyrs, to their last moment, refused to acknowledge or hold intercourse with the Montanist martyrs.

In fact there is nothing in these Acts to show whether or not Montanus had been heard of in Africa at the time they were written. There can be no greater mistake than to imagine that because a man believes in visions and revelations, he must necessarily have been a heretic. The visions of Hermas were, as we believe, anterior to Montanism, and certainly were received with regard by men who had no sympathy with that sect. It was no part of the faith of the Church then to believe that the age of miracles had ceased, and even at the present day, though in our Church the prevalent opinion is that it has, yet no one would be separated from Church communion because he was more easy of belief in this matter than the generality. Even now, remarkable instances of answer to prayer occur, which religiously minded persons find it hard to ascribe to fortuitous coincidence. Still more must such instances have occurred in those days of trial and persecution, when earnest prayer became a necessity of

¹ Mr. Harris does his best to damage this argument, by himself (p. 36) either wilfully or unintentionally committing the same error as Tertullian, in ascribing to Perpetua what is really part of a vision of Saturus.

² Quakerism supplied another sympathetic student of Christian antiquity in the late Mr. Backhouse, drawings made by whom have enabled Mr. Harris to ornament his volume with copies of the ancient mosaic portraits of Perpetua and Felicitas in the Archbishop's Palace at Ravenna.

the
thin
slau
Afr
in P
more
evid
seem
belie
that
place
a Mo
short
befor
of hi
to be
must
guish
after
was a
matte
gurate
Christ
new fa
enquir
was cl
rities
of the
God's
Church
develo
the wi
which
any so
pretens
The
and Fe
there h
sufferer
her con
himself
the fait
of the v
the stri
actors i

the Christian life, and when it was felt to be no improbable thing that God would interfere to rescue or avenge his slaughtered saints. When, therefore, the news first reached Africa that there had been a great outpouring of God's Spirit in Phrygia, the majority of Christians must have thought it more likely than not that the news was true. And if the evidence that Montanus had received divine communications seemed to them good enough, they were quite as free to believe it as a Roman Catholic was to believe the intelligence that a miraculous appearance of the Blessed Virgin had taken place at La Salette. The one no more deserved to be called a Montanist for so believing than the other a Salettist. In short African Christians believed in visions and revelations before ever they heard of Montanus; and after they did hear of him, they were free, without any breach with the Church, to believe that he had been inspired by God's Spirit. This must be borne in mind when an attempt is made to distinguish the writings which Tertullian composed before and after he was a Montanist. Some belong to the time when he was a believer in Montanus, yet no schismatic. What drove matters to a schism was the Montanist claim to have inaugurated a new dispensation, in which the truths revealed by Christ and His Apostles would be further developed, and new fasts and other new rules of life imposed. And when enquiry was made as to the authority to which submission was claimed, it was found that the local ecclesiastical authorities had come to the conclusion that the orgiastic methods of the new prophets showed that, instead of being inspired by God's Spirit, they were possessed by a demon. In truth, the Church would soon have come to an end if it had entrusted the development of its doctrines and the framing of its rules to the wildest and least discreet of its body. But the Acts with which we are here concerned were certainly written before any schism had taken place, and quite possibly before the pretensions of Montanus had made much noise in Africa.

The Acts are commonly known as the Acts of Perpetua and Felicitas. This may seem an injustice to the male sex, there being, besides the two women, four men among the sufferers, one of them, Saturus, to whom Perpetua had owed her conversion, and who, after her apprehension, presented himself of his own accord to share the lot of his children in the faith. But besides the honour justly due to the heroism of the weaker sex, we cannot wonder if, in comparison with the striking personality of Perpetua, the deeds of the other actors in the drama should seem scarce worthy of recollec-

tion. After a well-graced actor leaves the stage, the eyes of men are idly bent on him who enters next; so in reading these Acts, the scenes in which Perpetua appears stand out prominently before the mind, and so strong an impression is made by her nobility and her practical ability, that if we were condemned to write in one of those question-books which were in fashion a few years ago, and were called on to say what female character in history is most worthy of admiration, we do not know that we could make a better answer than Perpetua.

We can understand her character the better because so much of the story is told in her own words. The first thing that strikes us is the strong filial affection she exhibits. Her family had been heathen, she herself was but a catechumen; so was also her brother, but her father remained unconverted, and from the time Perpetua got notice of her approaching trial, and was put under surveillance,¹ he beset her with entreaties to deny her faith when brought before the magistrates. But from her point of view to say 'the thing that is not' was a simple impossibility. 'Do you see this vessel,' she said, 'it is a pitcher. Can you call it anything else? I am a Christian, and I can be called nothing else.' After she had been cast into prison he continued urging her, reminding her of the care he had ever taken of her, and the love he had borne her beyond any of his children. 'Think of your mother and your aunt and your infant son, who cannot live without you. Subdue your obstinate spirit, and do not ruin us all, for not one of us will be able to hold up our face if anything should happen to you.' Then he kissed her hands, and cast himself at her feet weeping, calling her, not Daughter, but Lady. She was terribly grieved, and said what she could to comfort him, but would make him no promise. She felt his sorrow all the more because he was the only one of the family who did not rejoice at her passion. Finally, when she was brought to trial, her father appeared bringing her infant with him. The magistrate seconded his entreaties that she would have compassion on his grey hairs, and take pity on her infant son; but when she persisted in her refusal the old man continued to be so clamorous in his entreaties to her, that the magistrate was obliged to

¹ *Ἐτι ἡμῶν παρατηρουμένων.* Gibbon (c. xvi.) favourably contrasts the processes of the heathen courts with those of the Inquisition, in that instead of seizing on a suspected person, they merely summoned him to appear before the tribunal at an appointed time. But this passage sufficiently disposes of his improbable suggestion, that it would be easy for the accused person, if not inclined for martyrdom, to use the interval to save himself by flight.

order
to haste
Perpetu
herself!

Her
a Roma
undergro
had Per
many w
in such a
a comm
sors, Sec
larly in
same wa
great use
get mon
instrume
bribes we
transferr
to conver
brother,
was allow
palace in
else.

If Pe
disgrace,
family.
as she wa
revealing
of Herma
communi
herself in
swords an
away all v
the faith,
climb, wa
She cried,
and up sh

¹ It is su
husband, an
time. Mr. F
recalls that
turn preach
same. This
been baptiz
that Revoca
VOL. XX

order him to be removed from the court. The lictor had to hasten his departure by striking him with his rod, and Perpetua tells how she felt the blow as if it had been given herself.¹

Her narrative enables us to realize what a frightful place a Roman prison was. The prisoners were thrust into small underground dungeons, without light or air. Never before had Perpetua experienced such horrible darkness. And so many were put in that the heat was stifling. No wonder that in such a Black Hole of Calcutta the death of a prisoner was a common occurrence. On this occasion one of the confessors, Secundus, so died. Another, Quintus, had died similarly in the same persecution. About sixteen died in the same way in the Lyons persecution of 177. Fortunately one great use of these dungeons to the jailers was that they might get money for letting prisoners out of them, and through the instrumentality of the deacons of the Church, the requisite bribes were administered, and Perpetua and her companions transferred to better quarters. The change included liberty to converse with her friends. She saw her mother and her brother, and was enabled to suckle her infant. When she was allowed to keep the babe with her the prison became a palace in her eyes, and she was happier there than anywhere else.

If Perpetua's father thought her imprisonment matter of disgrace, it was otherwise with the Christian members of her family. Her brother suggested to her that in such dignity as she was she would be successful if she asked for a vision revealing the issue of her trial. It is likely that the *Visions of Hermas* was a book then usually read in the Christian community. She promised to ask, and that night she saw herself in vision ascending a ladder all set with hooks and swords and javelins, and beneath it a huge dragon scaring away all who might have wished to mount. Her father in the faith, Saturus, went before her, and encouraged her to climb, warning her to beware lest the dragon should bite her. She cried, 'In the Name of Jesus Christ it shall not hurt me,' and up she went trampling on its head. At the top she found

¹ It is surprising that all through no mention is made of Perpetua's husband, and we know no better solution than that he was dead at the time. Mr. Harris, who is ever on the look out for Montanist illustrations, recalls that Montanus's two prophetesses had deserted their husbands to turn preachers, and suggests that Perpetua and Felicitas had done the same. This is a scandalous libel on poor Perpetua, who had not even been baptized at the time she was accused. As for Felicitas, it is likely that Revocatus, her fellow slave who suffered with her, was her husband.

a spacious meadow in which sat a white-haired shepherd of great size milking his flock. He welcomed her arrival, and gave her a morsel of the cheese or curd he was milking. She took it with joined hands; the bystanders cried Amen, and at the noise she awoke. From this vision she concluded that the result of her imprisonment would be not release but martyrdom, and that Satorus would suffer first.

There can be no doubt that the closing scene in this vision has a Eucharistic reference. Some very literal persons, not considering that in the fitness of things milk or cheese was what might be expected to be presented by a shepherd, have inferred that Perpetua must have belonged to a sect which celebrated its Eucharist with bread and cheese. Mr. Harris, in whose head Montanism is perpetually running, has revived an idea of Ittigius, that this was a Montanist practice, but this combination falls to pieces at every joint. That there were such people at all as those whom Epiphanius calls Artotyritæ is but hearsay repeated by him in the least authentic chapter of his work; Epiphanius thinks that the Artotyritæ were a sect akin to the Montanists, but he does not think that the Montanists generally had the peculiarity from which this sect derived its name, nor is there any other evidence to that effect. Lastly, there is no reason to think that Perpetua ever partook of a cheese Eucharist. She had been only baptized just before her apprehension, and very possibly had not partaken of the Eucharist more than once, and that must have been the Eucharist of the Catholic Church, with which she was in full communion.¹

One other of Perpetua's revelations must be mentioned on account of the controversial use that was early made of it. One day, in prison, when they were at prayers, the name

¹ This is clear from the manner in which the bishop is mentioned by Perpetua's fellow-martyr Satorus. In vision he saw himself entering Paradise with his companions, and there finding those who had been martyrs before him. At the entrance he saw Optatus the bishop, and Aspasius the Presbyter. Apparently they had had some dissension among themselves; possibly the election of Optatus had not been unanimous. Now, in the vision, they were seen casting themselves at the martyrs' feet imploring them to make reconciliation between them. But the martyrs, shocked at this reverence being paid them by their ecclesiastical superiors, protest: 'Why cast yourselves at our feet? Are you not our father, and you our Presbyter?' It is an amazing effect of prejudice that Mr. Harris (p. 36) imagines he finds 'pity or scorn' in the words *Ὁὐχὶ σὺ πάππας ἡμετέρος εἶ;* It is true that the bishop is ordered to rebuke his people for their party spirit, but the command is given him not by the martyrs but by angels. If Satorus had been set, by Montanist tendencies, at variance with his bishop, the angelic rebuke could have been, not for party spirit, but for slowness to believe a divine revelation.

of Din
brother
grene i
It had
looked
That ni
place, w
with thi
the basi
instant
dom she
light wh
of cheer
water w
and the
here is
crates h
Perpetua
was arre
imprison
more has
that Din
elders.
position
that unb
quently
anti-Pela
the Acts
owns the
that Dino
otherwise
and made
Consi
mind caus
it is not w
no one co
wits more
what a le
panions.
and as a R
the prison
prison (for
that there
cal incanta
treat such

of Dinocrates suddenly suggested itself to her. This was a brother of hers who had died when seven years old of a gangrene in his face, apparently some considerable time before. It had never occurred to her to pray for him before, but she looked on the suggestion as a divine admonition to do so now. That night in vision she saw the child coming out of a dark place, with his face all disfigured by the sore, and consumed with thirst, for though there was a fountain there, the rim of the basin was too high for the child to reach. She continued instant in prayer for him, and shortly before her martyrdom she again saw the child in vision, but now the place was light which had been dark before, the child was well clad and of cheerful countenance, the wound in his face was healed, the water was within his reach, and she saw him come and drink and then go off to play with other children. The difficulty here is that there is every reason to suppose that Dinocrates had never been baptized. The family was heathen; Perpetua and her brother were but catechumens when she was arrested, and were only baptized immediately before her imprisonment. It is not likely that there would have been more haste to baptize a younger child, and it is quite possible that Dinocrates may have died before the conversion of his elders. Accordingly, this story was much appealed to in opposition to the doctrine of St. Augustine, who held strongly that unbaptized infants could not be saved, and who consequently has to discuss this story three or four times in his anti-Pelagian treatise *De Anima*. His first answer is that the Acts of Perpetua are not Canonical Scripture; but as he owns them to contain divine revelations, he is reduced to say that Dinocrates must certainly have received baptism, since otherwise he could not have been cleansed from original sin and made capable of everlasting happiness.

Considering the age in which she lived, and the tension of mind caused by the circumstances in which she was placed, it is not wonderful that Perpetua should have had visions, but no one could have been less of a visionary or have had her wits more completely about her. Indeed, it is wonderful what a lead this girl of twenty-two took among her companions. No doubt she had made a distinguished marriage, and as a Roman matron had learned to rule her house. When the prisoners were experiencing rigid treatment in their last prison (for the tribune who had charge of them had been told that there was danger of their freeing themselves by magical incantations), Perpetua said to him, 'Is this the way you treat such notable prisoners as we, who are to be brought out

to do honour to Cæsar's birthday? Will it not be a disgrace to you if we come out in bad condition?' And the appeal was successful. Again, when they were to be brought out into the amphitheatre, it was attempted to force them, according to custom, to wear the habits, the men, of priests of Saturn, and the women, of Ceres. But Perpetua remonstrated. 'This is not fair treatment; we are giving our lives in order that we may have nothing to do with idolatry; you ought to keep your part of the bargain.' The justice of her appeal was acknowledged, and they were permitted to wear their own garments.

When the martyrs made their procession into the amphitheatre, the Christians marked the calm dignity with which Perpetua moved along, and the bold confidence with which she faced the gaze of the brutal spectators. Ἡκολούθη δὲ ἡ Περπετούα πρῶτος βαδίζουσα ὡς ματρώνα Χριστοῦ, ἐγρηγόρη ὀφθαλμῷ, καὶ τῇ προσόψει καταβάλλουσα τὰς πάντων ὁράσεις. When exposed to the beasts, Perpetua was in such exaltation of spirit that she had scarce knowledge of what was befalling her. She was put into a net and tossed by a wild cow. Unconscious of pain, but mindful of her modesty, she pinned together her torn garment, and fastened up her dishevelled hair. Then she rose and went to pick up her fellow-sufferer, the slave-girl Felicitas. Yet these acts must have been performed almost mechanically, for when presently the cruelty of the spectators, satiated for the time, permitted her to stand aside,¹ and wait without further torture for the last act of the drama, she seemed to wake out of sleep and asked when she was to be cast to the wild cow. And it was not until a catechumen who stood by the barrier pointed out to her the marks on her own person of what she had gone through, that she could be persuaded that she had already sustained the trial. She sent the catechumen to fetch her brother, and exhorted them both to stand fast in the faith, to love one another, and not be scandalized by the sufferings which they witnessed. Finally, when the other martyrs had also finished their combat with the beasts, the spectators would not permit them to be privately despatched by the *confectores*, but insisted on witnessing the closing scene. The martyrs walked as they were desired to the midst of the arena, gave each

¹ She was sent to the πύλη ζωτικῇ, through which surviving gladiators and pardoned criminals passed out; her male companions to the opposite gate through which the dead bodies were wont to be removed. But if there had ever been a thought of making a difference in their fate, it was soon abandoned.

other the
But Per
ator, cou
his swor
unclean
own con

We l
Felicitas,
untold, in
to turn to
tion was
edition o
story, it
through a
story itse
manner i
sides, com
gible by
whose me
well worth
establishin
known in
been doubl

For so
with writ
Latin cha
with that
predomina
idea was
polemical
text of th
neutralize
sideration
Latin tran
argued tha
felt in Af
used, and a
his theory
by a comp
But the te
the confide
The pecul
would now
Roman La
we have no

other the kiss of peace, and submitted in silence to the blow. But Perpetua, struck in the ribs by an inexperienced gladiator, could not help screaming, and her last act was to guide his sword to a more fatal place, as if, says the narrator, the unclean spirit dared not slay so noble a woman without her own consent.

We have not left ourselves space to speak of Saturus and Felicitas, and are not sorry to leave much that is interesting untold, in order that the reader may have the more inducement to turn to the original for himself. Indeed, our original intention was only to speak of the distinctive features of this new edition of the Acts, but no matter how often one has read this story, it is hardly possible to take it up without reading it through again, and we found that the interest inspired by the story itself was far higher than that which could be felt in the manner in which it has been presented by the editor. Besides, comment on the latter would hardly have been intelligible by a reader to whom either the story was new, or in whose memory it was not fresh. This edition, however, is well worthy of special attention, as giving a Greek text, and establishing it as the original of a document previously only known in a Latin form, the originality of which had not been doubted.

For several years back it had become a commonplace with writers on ecclesiastical history to insist on the specially Latin character of the early African Church as contrasted with that of the Roman Church, in which the Greek element predominated until near the end of the second century. The idea was started in 1835 by Cardinal Wiseman with a polemical object in view. He was writing in defence of the text of the Three Heavenly Witnesses, and he thought to neutralize the negative evidence of St. Augustine by the consideration that that Father only used the 'Italic' form of the Latin translation, whereas the oldest form was African. He argued that the need of a Latin translation would be more felt in Africa than in Rome, where Greek was extensively used, and at first even for liturgical purposes; and he confirmed his theory of the African origin of the old Latin translation by a comparison of its Latinity with that of African writers. But the tendency of modern research has been to diminish the confidence with which we can hold Wiseman's conclusions. The peculiarities of Latinity to which he called attention would now be said not so much to distinguish African from Roman Latin, as rather colloquial from literary Latin. And we have now begun to think that Africa in the second century

did not so much differ from Rome as to the acquaintance of the higher classes with Greek. It had been known that Tertullian wrote some of his earlier tracts in Greek, yet this did not prevent its being a surprise when in 1881 Usener published Greek Acts of the Scillitan Martyrs of the year 180, and when it appeared that the extant Latin Acts of these African martyrs were but translations from this Greek. The question still remained whether this Greek itself might not have been a translation from the Latin, and it was urged that it was improbable that a trial at Carthage would have been conducted in Greek or that a Greek document would have been composed in so Latinized a city. The present work provides new data for the solution of the problem. The Acts of Perpetua and Felicitas had only been known in Latin, and no one suspected that they were a translation from the Greek until, in the discussion about the Scillitan Acts, Aubé threw out the idea, without however obtaining much acceptance for it. It is true that the Latin Acts contain a few Greek words, but it had not been thought strange that a lady of Perpetua's high position¹ should have been acquainted with Greek, and should occasionally use a Greek word. But the case assumes a new aspect through Mr. Harris's discovery of what he is certainly right in pronouncing the Greek original of the Latin Acts. He found it in the library of the Holy Sepulchre at Jerusalem, the same in which, when the books were at Constantinople Bryennios discovered the complete copy of the Epistles of Clement of Rome and the *Didaché*; and whence also, since the restoration of the books to Jerusalem, Mr. Harris was able to publish a photographic edition of the *Didaché*. The originality of the Greek is proved; in the first place by a comparison of the two forms of the Latin, which in many places agree in sense, though differing in language, the explanation being that the two are independent translations from the newly discovered Greek; and in the second place by a number of instances in which difficulties in the Latin are explained by means of the Greek. One example will suffice to illustrate the nature of the argument. The Acts relate how Perpetua was for a time relieved from her father's importunity by his being obliged to travel away. When he reappears again the Greek with perfect consistency introduces him in the words *παρεγένετο δὲ καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ἐκ τῆς πολλῆς ἀποδημίας μαραινόμενος*. The Latin has: 'supervenit autem et de civitate pater meus consumptus tædio.' It is evident that this is the work of

¹ She is described as *γεννηθεῖσα εὐγενῶς, καὶ τραφεῖσα πολυτελῶς γαμηθεῖσα τε ἐξόχως*.

a trans-
his copy
did not
clusion
is quite
with cer

Wit-
written
we belie
written
Phrygia
in adop
adverse
namely,
conduct
The Act
Those o
time of
first; fo
seem to
came int
in Africa
Church
ceptional
martyrs
that the
Africa m
version o
if it was
Acts of
reasonab
quity of
conduct
century;
Latin ver
time whe

¹ There
our copy
from the La
and there a
Thus we ca
smitten on
percussa;
noticed in a
October 29
review, bec
independen

a translator who either through carelessness or through fault of his copy read *ἐκ τῆς πόλεως* instead of *ἐκ τῆς πολλῆς*, and then did not know what to make of *ἀποδημίας*. Of course no conclusion could safely be drawn from a single instance, but there is quite a sufficient number of cases of the kind to establish with certainty that the Latin is a translation from the Greek.¹

With regard to the question, how came the narrative to be written in Greek at all, an easy solution would present itself if we believed the Acts to be Montanist—namely, that it was so written in order to be communicated to sympathisers in Phrygia; but we believe that the true solution is to be found in adopting a theory of Zahn's, which, in spite of strong adverse prepossession, is forcing itself on our acceptance, namely, that public worship in the Church of Africa was conducted in Greek until the very end of the second century. The Acts of Martyrs furnished matter for Church reading. Those of Perpetua and Felicitas were read in Church in the time of St. Augustine, and no doubt were so read from the first; for the fact that they contained matter which might seem to favour Montanism affords a presumption that they came into Church reading before the Montanist controversy in Africa had become violent. That they also formed part of Church reading in Rome may be gathered from the exceptional appearance of the names of these non-Roman martyrs in the Canon of the Mass. Thus, while we admit that the records of the proceedings of proconsular courts in Africa must have been Latin, we can understand how a Greek version of the Acts of the Scillitan martyrs had to be made if it was to be used for Church reading. Similarly for the Acts of Perpetua. The same argument disposes of very unreasonable doubts entertained by Mr. Harris as to the antiquity of the Latin version. The Church Service was conducted in Africa in Latin at least very early in the third century; certainly before the time of St. Cyprian. The Latin version of these Acts must be at least as old as the time when they first came to be read in Latin in church.

¹ There are also cases where the Latin translation helps us to correct our copy of the Greek. Mr. Harris restores in his Greek text some words from the Latin, the omission of which was obviously due to homeöteuton, and there are other cases besides those acknowledged by Mr. Harris. Thus we cannot doubt that Perpetua's words when she saw her father smitten on her account, 'Doluit mihi casus patris mei quasi ego fuissem percussa,' are genuine, though not found in the Greek. This point is noticed in an admirable review of Mr. Harris's book in the *Guardian* of October 29. Perhaps we are tempted to think the more highly of this review, because all the writer's judgments agree with those we had formed independently.

That must certainly have been before the year 350; how much earlier, the reader may determine.

We have one other point to touch on in conclusion. Bishop Lightfoot had noticed some coincidences between our Acts and the Ignatian Epistles which led him to believe that these Epistles must have been known to the writer of the Acts. There was no antecedent probability that the letters of a Syrian bishop should find their way to Africa, so that, though valuable testimony to the genuineness of the letters would be gained if Lightfoot's view should be established, no suspicion of spuriousness arises if it should not. Now Mr. Harris points out that on the recovery of the Greek text of the Acts their coincidences with Ignatius disappear, the coincidences being in the thoughts, not at all in the words. The result is that we can no longer press Lightfoot's argument (and a couple of his instances certainly fail), but we are not prepared to say that it is certain there is nothing in it. Men differ very much in their powers of verbal memory. We can speak with feeling, for often when we try to quote what we have read, and find ourselves unable to give more than the general sense, we have been put to the blush by others who can reproduce the very words. Now, there is a somewhat parallel case in the coincidences between our Acts and the Gospel of St. Luke. When these Acts say of Secundus, who died in prison, that though the sword did not pass through his flesh, it passed through his soul, Mr. Harris not unnaturally notes in his margin the coincidence with Luke ii. 35, yet the words in the one case are *διεξήλθεν τὸ ξίφος*, in the other *διελεύσεται ῥομφαία*. Again, when Perpetua seeing Dinocrates in her vision says that betwixt her and him there was a great interval, Mr. Harris notes in his margin Luke xvi. 26, yet there is no verbal coincidence between *μέγα διάστημα* and *μέγα χάσμα*. No one can doubt that the words of the preface, 'The things we have seen and heard and handled we announce to you,' are taken from 1 John, yet we have *ἡκουσάμην* instead of *ἀκηκόαμεν*, and *εὐαγγελιζόμεθα* instead of *ἀπαγγέλλομεν*.

As we have so often had to express difference of opinion with Mr. Rendel Harris, we cannot take leave of him without expressing the gratitude which students of antiquity owe him for his indefatigable industry, his fertility of suggestion, and his great ingenuity of combination. Pity it is that he must have the defects of his qualities, and that with his gifts cannot be combined greater sobriety of judgment. If anyone wishes to see how, having built one shaky story of a house of cards, he will, with the utmost calmness, put another

story
he dra
mome
to det

The S
so

ACCI
these
tempo
from c
sugge
sorialy

W
and w
must
hardly
remine
career
ence o
turn u

I.
roman
of tha
the Si
deferre
depict
ander
The y
capaci
details
to suc
physio
and ce
young
and th

¹ A
tion of
Suprem
powers,

story upon the top of it, he has only to read the inferences he draws from the simple fact that the martyrs at their last moment gave each other the kiss, and how he proceeds thence to determine the weekday and the year of their martyrdom.

ART. V.—SIR WALTER SCOTT.

The Journal of Sir Walter Scott. From the Original Manuscript at Abbotsford. Two Volumes. (Edinburgh, 1890.)

ACCIDENTAL circumstances have rendered our notice of these interesting volumes later than that of most of our contemporaries. We trust, however, that it may be possible, from our own point of view, to consider some of the problems suggested by them in aspects either neglected or very cursorily treated by critics who have preceded us.

What degree of information respecting Walter Scott's life and writings may be assumed on the part of our readers is, it must be owned, rather a matter of guesswork. But we can hardly go very far wrong if we venture in the first place to remind them of what may be called the outward facts of his career, and then attempt to frame some estimate of the influence of his age upon Scott's mind and of his influence in turn upon his contemporaries and their successors.

I. Walter Scott was born at Edinburgh—'mine own romantic town'—in August 1771. His father was a solicitor of that slightly higher grade known in Scotland as Writers to the Signet.¹ The cautious temper and somewhat extreme deference to men of rank displayed by the father have been depicted by the son in the tale of *Redgauntlet*: Mr. Alexander Fairford, W.S., being understood to represent him. The youthful Walter inherited from his father a very real capacity for work, such as mastery of the law, and even for details of business; and if he had chosen to devote himself to such pursuits he might have succeeded in them. But physiologists, in these days, tell us a good deal about *atavism*; and certainly from his forbears (as the Scotch call them) the young man derived some very different qualities. The chase and the battle-field had been far more to their taste than the

¹ A W. S. (Latinized *Signeti Regii Scriba*) can authorize the application of the Royal Signet to a given document. The Solicitor of the Supreme Court (*S. S. C.*), though in many respects possessing equal powers, seems to enjoy less prestige than his fellow-lawyer.

counting-house or the law-courts; and their descendant, though he became a fairly good lawyer and fully competent to the duties of his office of Sheriff, did not pretend to have risen to those heights of jurisprudential science which are looked for in an occupant of the Bench. That he could have, with fair play, superintended creditably the affairs of a commercial firm seems highly probable. But, alas! as will be seen, he never gave himself that fair play.

As a schoolboy at a private academy near Edinburgh, Scott was regarded as an idler; and he himself in after days regretfully admitted the justice of the charge. Two gifts, however, made a marked impression upon his schoolfellows. These were his prodigious memory for any kind of knowledge that really interested him, and his power of story-telling. Wild tales of knight-errantry, of battles and enchantments, were secretly continued from week to week amidst rambles with chosen companions through the scenery of Mid-Lothian, and we cannot doubt but that, in his own way, the lad was giving himself a self-education for his destined pursuits. A lameness in one leg proved fatal to his desire to enter the military profession; but throughout his life he always, and it would seem with perfect sincerity, honoured the doers of great deeds far more highly than the narrators of their achievements; and declared that he would willingly sacrifice all his literary fame for the glory of having been a general of division in the army which followed Wellington through his campaigns in the Peninsula.

His education at school and at the University of Edinburgh made him a very fair Latinist, and he combined with this some knowledge of French and German, of Italian and Spanish. Although his command of these languages was probably not of a very critical character,¹ it was sufficient to enable him to read with enjoyment a great deal of the literature, especially the poetic literature, of modern Europe. Ariosto, as might be expected, was a special favourite; Bürger's *Lenore* was rendered into spirited English verse; and the rising genius of Goethe gave a further impulse to his budding gift for poetry by inducing him to publish a translation of *Götz von Berlichingen*.

¹ A gentleman who visited Abbotsford in 1843 was surprised to see among its curiosities a bronze circlet embossed with an eagle, which professed to have been picked up upon the field of Waterloo. The legend around it bore, in French, the words, 'Napoleon to the fifth division of the great Army.' Unluckily, the word *fifth*, instead of being given as *5ième*, was represented by *5th*. That this obvious proof of English forgery should not have struck Scott's eye is wonderful.

F
after
earlie
have
to th
by th
Subs
tish
comm
from
Ettri
a jus
the v
plod
times
earlie
if the
verse
of Bo
a veri
Bo
going
lives
He ha
before
indulg
Lady
marrie
Sir W
suitor
friend
felt th
that th
justific
Th
effects
Italian
hardly
and se
fiand
of Lo
fortune
Sir He
¹ M
besides

But we are anticipating. It was not until seven years after 1792 (the date of his call to the Scottish Bar)—that this earliest effort of Scott's muse appeared. It might conceivably have endangered his practice; but he had just been appointed to that minor sort of judgeship, which is executed in Scotland by the Sheriffs of counties and their deputies, the Sheriffs-Substitute. In 1802 he produced his *Minstrelsy of the Scottish Border*, a collection of ballads with introductions and comments; in which task he received considerable assistance from two friends—James Hogg (subsequently known as the Ettrick Shepherd) and Charles Kirkpatrick Sharpe. It was a justly successful venture, for it brought before the public the variety of Scott's powers—his keenness in the line of plodding research, his aptitude for describing the life of past times, and his own very considerable gifts as a rival to these earlier minstrels. His own ballads stand in the collection as if they won their place by right. *Cadyow Castle*, a narrative in verse of the assassination of the Regent Murray by Hamilton of Bothwellhaugh, has been justly selected by good judges as a veritable *chef d'œuvre* of its kind.

But in the meantime the youthful bard had been undergoing a lesson of education, effective and influential in the lives of many men, but often specially so in the case of poets. He had fallen in love about 1790 (that is to say, two years before donning the advocate's gown), and for six years had indulged the hope that Margaret, daughter of Sir John and Lady Jane Stuart Belches, would become his bride. But she married a banker, Mr. William Forbes (afterwards known as Sir William Forbes of Pitsligo), and though the successful suitor became in later time one of Scott's best and kindest friends, there seems little doubt but that the poet not only felt the blow almost to his latest day, but also considered that the lady had given an amount of encouragement which justified allusions to her as his 'false love.'

Three English poets of our own age have depicted the effects of rejected love upon the human mind; and an Italian bard, Giuseppe Giusti, was in his own person more hardly treated than Walter Scott, inasmuch as the beautiful and seemingly devout lady who jilted him was actually his *fiancée*. We cannot pause to dwell on Tennyson's two poems of *Locksley Hall*, nor on the varied effects of such a misfortune as portrayed by Robert Browning.¹ But a third poet, Sir Henry Taylor, has declared in plainest prose his convic-

¹ Mr. Nettleship counts up some twelve in Browning's earlier poems, besides a few from the woman's side.

tion that a lofty nature, strong enough to bear the pressure, will be more ennobled and purified by such a disappointment than it would have been by success.¹ One cannot but hope that it thus fared with Scott. Certainly the references to the subject, both in his verse and his prose, are very marked, and display a pathetic reality that it would have been hard to attain, if imagination had not been quickened by experience.

Scott did not, like Giusti, forswear matrimony altogether. A year after Margaret Belches had become Mrs. Forbes he married a French lady, an exile from the Revolution—Miss Charpentier, or (in Anglicized form) Carpenter. She had beauty and some fortune; and, though not a helpmeet in the capacity for appreciating his genius or in the way of lending much support to him in his troubles, she could exult in his successes, and displayed in her latest hours much Christian fortitude. She was a much more regular attendant upon worship than her husband, and her place in an Episcopalian church (St. George's, we believe) was seldom vacant during such part of her married life as was spent in Edinburgh.

Association with members of the great house of Buccleuch, to whose head Scott always looked up as his feudal chieftain, led to the composition of *The Lay of the Last Minstrel*. For the moment we have only to remark on the extraordinary success of the poem in the matter of sale. Published in 1805, when the poet was thirty-four years of age, it brought to its author a sum of money not very far short of 800*l*. *Marmion* (justly ranked by Lockhart and others as his greatest poem) followed three years later, to be soon succeeded by *The Lady of the Lake*; which, if inferior in power, at least showed business men that imagination may have closer links with finance than the Stock Exchange and the banking-house had realised. In the year after its publication the post-horse duty rose in Scotland; and to calculate the sums since levied from English, from Continental, from American purses by the way in which Scott made his country known, and brought tourists, holiday-makers, sportsmen, and yachtsmen to visit it, would produce figures absolutely startling.

So far, however, as poetry was concerned, the tide of popularity soon ebbed. A good case for the superiority of *Rokeby* over *The Lady of the Lake* might easily be made; but the public wanted a change, and a change was provided for it by the pen which wrote *Childe Harold* and *The Giaour*, *The Bride of Abydos*, and *The Corsair*.

¹ Notes on Life, 'Of Choice in Marriage.' The whole passage is one of much beauty.

him
for,
prin
fortu
hous
more
resid
beco
know

whil
wor
dece
well
buil
know
Milt
John
chil
Fran
of di

anor
publ
tro
conn
Wan
side
upor
two i
—m
they
men
besic
nove
cont
men
Duri
the a
and
consi
The

1
salary

But Scott had a reserve in store, one unsuspected even by himself. It was desirable for him to have such a resource; for, although his sheriffship (with the additional salary of the principal clerkship in the Court of Session,¹ and of his wife's fortune) had enabled him to live in comfort at a small country house called Ashestiel, in Selkirkshire, he had now taken a more ambitious home some five miles distant. For this new residence he invented a name, and he looked forward to becoming the founder of a fresh branch of his clan, to be known henceforth as the Scotts of Abbotsford.

'Thou hast spoken also of thy servant's house for a great while to come.' The character of him who uttered these words must surely remove such an aspiration from being deemed an ignoble one. But the Shepherd-King was poet as well as warrior. The combination of authorship with the building up of an honoured stock has rarely, if ever, been known in the Britain of modern days. Shakespeare and Milton left only daughters; Dryden, Pope, Addison, and Johnson were childless; Burke and Hallam outlived their children. The same phenomenon has been remarked in France, not only as regards men of letters, but also in respect of distinguished votaries of science.

The new venture, as our readers are well aware, was the anonymous publication of a series of fictions known to the public as the *Waverley Novels*. In the first three the author trod on native ground, depicting scenes and characters in connection with three periods of the previous sixty years. *Waverley* had been begun at a much earlier date, but laid on one side; it was now taken up, finished in hot haste, and launched upon a public to whom it certainly gave a new sensation. Its two immediate followers—*Guy Mannering* and *The Antiquary*—must be considered superior to *Waverley* as works of art, and they probably stand in the first rank of their author's achievements. *Waverley* came out in 1814. Between this and 1819, besides some minor poems, was published that section of the novels described as *Tales of my Landlord*. This section also contains some of Scott's very best work; it must suffice to mention *Old Mortality* and *The Bride of Lammermoor*. During the next four years—that is, between 1819 and 1823—the author, so to speak, left his native land, invading England and the Continent. This period embraces *Ivanhoe*—by some considered the most imaginative of the series—*Kenilworth*, *The Fortunes of Nigel*, *Peperil of the Peak*, and *Quentin Dur-*

¹ Scott had for some years fulfilled these duties gratuitously, the salary being paid to a retired clerk.

ward. Nevertheless, Scotland was not wholly deserted, as was proved by *The Monastery*, *The Abbot*, and *The Pirate*. The remaining ones, though they would have made the fortune of any other novelist of his time, cannot probably be placed in quite so high a rank. The list between 1824 and 1829 includes *St. Ronan's Well*, *Woodstock*, *The Fair Maid of Perth*, and *Anne of Geierstein*. Certainly few writers in the same space of time had ever covered so large a canvas, filled with such a variety of characters and embracing so wide a range, both of time and country. Nor must it be forgotten that, whatever may be their literary defects, few authors so prolific have ever been so thoroughly blameless in respect of tone.

The success in the enthrallment of the public, followed by the receipt of unheard-of sums for these publications, was immense. But behind these triumphs a dark and tragic reverse was being wrought out. The land-hunger which was a craze with Scott, and which scarcely left him till his dying day, urged him to add acre to acre and field to field around Abbotsford, to say nothing of lavish expenditure in antiquities and in the decoration of his mansion. The sum needed for these ambitious ends was provided in two ways. In the first place, Scott received a large amount beforehand for at least four novels, of which not one line was written. Secondly, he secretly became a partner in the publishing house of the Ballantynes.

Now how far trade should be blended with the pursuits of lairds and lawyers must be considered a question of a conventional character. Certainly the merchant princes of Tyre and Genoa, of Florence and Venice, contrived to hold their own among the aristocracies of Europe. In France the feeling, we suspect, was somewhat different. Even a cadet of a noble house, if he embarked in trade, was, if we mistake not, expected to drop the distinctive particle 'de'; though he might possibly resume it if he could retire with a fortune, and thenceforth (as Yorkshire folks phrase it) 'live upright.' Probably in Scott's day one who was a sheriff and a laird could not without some loss of caste have openly admitted that he was in any sense a tradesman. But the very fact that one of the partners in the concern could not take an open part in their proceedings must have greatly increased the liability to complications.

We cannot undertake to discuss the problem concerning the amount of blame respectively due to Scott and to his partners for the crash which came. Singularly enough,

Scott
perso
the f
unde
enorm
L
but h
He w
father
their
He h
son's
Purd
befor
large
Walt
invas
corres
had n
M
Churc
had t
world
to W
adver
credit
1820
credit
tasks
health
shine
what
though
work,
a thin
Grand
—Cou
the st
that it
avowe
suspec
letters
sympt
retired
Italy,

Scott's only too favourable estimate of the writings of other persons, especially young beginners, formed one element of the failure. The Ballantynes were not equal to the task they undertook, and the result was an utter bankruptcy for the enormous sum of 130,000*l*.

During all this time Scott had been very hospitable; but he never gave himself airs on the strength of his triumphs. He was admirable in all the relations of life, as son, husband, father, and master. His servants were devoted to him, and their delight in his elevation occasionally took amusing forms. He had accepted the baronetcy from George IV. more for his son's sake than his own; but his *factotum* out of doors, Tom Purdie, immediately seized every sheep on the estate, and before the W. S. which had been branded on them added a large S., to intimate that these animals belonged to Sir Walter Scott. Scott had also allowed Abbotsford to be invaded by hosts of visitors, and had kept up an immense correspondence with many young *débutants* in letters, who had not the slightest claim upon his attention.

Much has been written on the way in which great men in Church and State would never have displayed all their worth, had they not been submitted to a reverse of fortune. In the world of letters this praise must be ungrudgingly accorded to Walter Scott. The gallant manner in which he faced adversity, the extraordinary efforts which he made to pay his creditors, all redound to his honour. In the six years between 1820 and 1826 he had raised so much as to be able to pay his creditors nearly one-third of their dues. Undoubtedly the tasks thus accomplished under pressure of anxiety and failing health were less brilliant than those produced during the sunshine of his career. The *Life of Napoleon Buonaparte* was not what Scott might have produced under happier circumstances; though it was really, all difficulties considered, an extraordinary work, and received a favourable notice from so independent a thinker as the American, Dr. Channing. The *Tales of a Grandfather* were more successful, but the two latest novels—*Count Robert of Paris* and *Castle Dangerous*—written after the stroke of paralysis—are simply melancholy. It is singular that it was not till several years after his failure that he openly avowed his authorship of the novels, though it had long been suspected; and we might almost say proved, by the ingenious letters of Mr. Adolphus. It was in November 1830 that the symptoms of gradual paralysis appeared, and Sir Walter retired from his office in the Court of Session. A visit to Italy, in which he was allowed the favour of a passage in a

ship of the Royal Navy, proved useless; and on his return to Abbotsford, in July 1832, he died at the age of sixty-one, Lady Scott having predeceased him by some six years. Scott lies buried, and not without a certain fitness, in the beautiful grounds that surround Dryburgh Abbey. The remainder of the debt was cleared off after his decease. A public subscription secured Abbotsford to his family.

II. And now let us try to glance at the influence of Scott's age upon his genius and character. It of course affected him in a literary, a political, and a religious point of view.

In the literary aspect of the case he must, we think, be pronounced to have been exceedingly fortunate. He was not, like Johnson, born at a period when Dryden and Pope were regarded as kings of poetry. It is true that Scott valued their poetry very highly, and among his other toils found time to issue a well-executed edition of the works of Dryden. He greatly prized Dr. Johnson's vigorous paraphrases of Juvenal, and believed that the *Vanity of Human Wishes* not unfrequently drew tears from eyes that had wandered drily over stanzas of professed sentimentality. But the danger of anything like excessive devotion to a particular style was balanced in Scott's case by many other elements. His knowledge of foreign languages—his admiration, for instance, of Ariosto—introduced him to other realms of fancy. The Percy Ballads had undoubtedly suggested to him the happy thought of similar research in his own land. Burns, too, whom he only met once, had struck another chord; and Scott—we believe, with perfect sincerity—always regarded Burns as a greater and more original poet than himself.

Above all, he had another tutor of whom Dryden and Pope knew but little. Outward nature had been to him in its own way as dear as to Wordsworth. It is enough to make mention of the introduction to the third canto of *Marmion*, or the still earlier lines, which perhaps have almost grown hackneyed, wherein the Last Minstrel apostrophizes his native land:

‘Oh, Caledonia, stern and wild,
Meet nurse for a poetic child.’

It is true that in this preparation for compositions yet to come, Greek was almost omitted, but in Scott's day Greek was not greatly studied in Scotland. Sydney Smith, in describing Scott's contemporary, Sir James Macintosh, apolo-

gizes
of At
what
never
with
must
ignora
and g
roman
his ov
withou
estima
limitat
that th
bered
to elec
condes
most e
in our
devote
to und
have e
‘Let u
disposi
at least
which
which
to der
with a
was pe
Isles, w
with B
noble s
those A
defeat
best ba
glad to
Lang
their op
for Sco

¹ Let
Good W
we only
not havin
Mr. Bag
VOL.

gizes for his friend's imperfect acquaintance with the tongue of Athens, as compared with that of Rome, by remarking—what would now be very untrue—that 'the Greek language never crossed the Tweed in any great force.' But we agree with Mr. Hutton—to whose admirable brief biography we must make the most ample acknowledgments—that this ignorance was hardly to be regretted. Scott himself justly and gracefully apologized to his friend Erskine for his romantic, unclassic style being something that was at least his own, which he could not marshal into classic order without ceasing to be himself. We must not pause to estimate the precise rank and value of Scott's poetry; its limitations are obvious, and he himself was not at all surprised that the public became tired of it, though it must be remembered that his then chief rival, Byron, but too often appealed to elements of success to which Scott would never have condescended. If we wished to emphasize by contrast the most extreme opposite phase of poetry, we should be inclined in our own day to name that of Robert Browning. Persons devotedly attached to one of these two styles are very likely to undervalue the other. But Scott himself would, we think, have endorsed the excellent advice of Sir Henry Taylor: 'Let us admire all that can be admired without debasing the dispositions or stultifying the understanding.' Scott's poetry is at least frank, hearty, and natural. Let us indicate one point which we have not seen noticed: he illustrates a position to which we may again recur—namely, that poetry often seems to derive some of its choicest inspirations from sympathy with a losing cause. Scott's lines on Waterloo are poor—it was perhaps too recent an event; but in the *Lord of the Isles*, wherein he celebrates the prowess of those who charged with Bruce to victory at Bannockburn, he is far, far below the noble standard which he reached, when depicting the loss of those *Flowers of the Forest* that fell around their king in the defeat of Flodden. It may be added that some of his very best ballads might be cited in the same direction. We are glad to find such critics as Mr. Palgrave and Mr. Andrew Lang joining with Mr. Hutton, in having the courage of their opinions, and daring to express considerable admiration for Scott's poetry.¹

¹ Let us also refer to the charming papers of Mr. John Dennis in *Good Words* for November and December 1890. It is right to add that we only know of the praise of the other two gentlemen at second-hand, not having yet read their criticisms. The same must be said of the late Mr. Bagehot's review of Scott's novels.

But, of course, we must all admit that his prose compositions gave him opportunities, which his poetry did not, of showing his keen sense of the prose of life, its homeliness and humour along with its pathos and romance. It is commonly said that he almost entirely abstains from portraying characters influenced by the deepest of all motives—namely, those which spring from religion—and Jeanie Deans is pointed at as being a sole and remarkable exception. This is in the main true; but we venture to think that it is slightly overstated. For instance, an able and learned work on *The Atonement*, by the late Mr. Oxenham, concludes by reference to a remark on the domination, in this life, of sorrow over joy. How many who read it remember that its author is referring to a remark of Walter Scott's? The Puritans who come to the Squire's banquet in *Pevenil of the Peak*, sing a song as they march, which is heard by the Cavaliers.

'At first it was answered with a scornful laugh, raised to as much height as the scoffers' lungs would permit, in order that it might carry to the psalmists the contempt of their auditors; but this was a forced exertion of party spleen. There is something in melancholy feelings more natural to an imperfect and suffering state than in those of gaiety, and when they are brought into collision the former seldom fail to triumph. If a funeral train and wedding procession were to meet unexpectedly, it will readily be allowed that the mirth of the last would be speedily merged in the gloom of the others.'

Again, Cardinal Newman, in his *Grammar of Assent*, touches on a point he was fond of urging in his Anglican days—namely, the instinctive power of goodness to detect danger without the presence of what seems cogent and visible evidence. Whence does he fetch his illustration? It is also from *Pevenil of the Peak*.

'The innocent Alice, without being able to discover what was wrong either in the scenes of unusual luxury with which she was surrounded, or in the manners of her hostess, which, both from nature and policy, were kind and caressing, felt nevertheless an instinctive apprehension that all was not right—a feeling in the human mind allied, perhaps, to that sense of danger which animals exhibit when placed in the vicinity of the natural enemies of their race, and which makes birds cower when the hawk is in the air, and beasts tremble when the tiger is abroad in the desert.'

We should also be inclined to maintain that, in their respective ways, Rebecca in *Ivanhoe*, Minna in *The Pirate*, and Josiah Cargill in *St. Ronan's Well*, are all depicted as persons most seriously influenced by religious principle. And the same must surely be asserted respecting the nobler

sp
coun
deep
be
actu
Burl
Risin
trati
terri
by—
Well
Clara
all to

"
doubt
" "
and th
me th
agonie
been l
throug
for me

W
Fair
Ramo
to his

'H
bedside
charge,

" "
the sha
ungrate
Thy ha
him.
sellor, a
pardon

Assure
describ
religion
men sa
his pow

We
the poli
political
that eac

specimens of the Covenanters, who suffer so terribly and so courageously in *Old Mortality*. But, further, Scott was deeply conscious of the way in which the human heart may be hardened by perverted fanaticism or by indulgence in actual sin. In writing this we are not thinking of Balfour of Burley in *Old Mortality*, of Ulrica in *Ivanhoe*, or of Bertram Risingham in *Rokeby*, though all of these might serve as illustrations of our meaning; but we rather call attention to a terrible instance that seems to us to be in general utterly passed by—we mean the deathbed of Hannah Irwin in *St. Ronan's Well*. She has, by her machinations, entangled the heroine, Clara Mowbray, in fearful difficulties, and, while she confesses all to Cargill, she declares herself unable to repent.

"Do not yet despair," said Cargill, "Grace is omnipotent—to doubt this is in itself a great crime."

"Be it so!—I cannot help it—my heart is hardened, Mr. Cargill; and there is something here"—she pressed her bosom—"which tells me that, with prolonged life and renewed health, even my present agonies would be forgotten, and I should become the same I have been before. I have rejected the offer of grace, Mr. Cargill, and not through ignorance, for I have sinned with my eyes open. Care not for me, then, who am a mere outcast."

With this should also be compared chapter xvii. in the *Fair Maid of Perth*, where the awakening of Sir John Ramorny is described; and his subsequent dream in relation to his pupil the young Duke of Rothesay.

"He thought that the shade of Queen Annabella stood by his bedside, and demanded the youth whom she had placed under his charge, simple, virtuous, gay, and innocent.

"Thou hast rendered him reckless, dissolute, and vicious," said the shade of pallid Majesty. "Yet I thank thee, John of Ramorny, ungrateful to me, false to thy word, and treacherous to my hopes. Thy hate shall counteract the evil which thy friendship has done to him. And well do I hope, that, now thou art no longer his counsellor, a bitter penance on earth may purchase my ill-fated child pardon and acceptance in a better world."

Assuredly of such an author we cannot say that he has never described the darker side of our nature in connexion with religion. He is not to be ranked among those writers of whom men say, 'He never awes us,' although, in order to appreciate his power, the entire scene ought certainly to be read.

We pass to a very different phase of life—the influence of the politics of his age on Scott's mind. We suppose that all political parties have their nobler and their baser side, and that each in turn, however far mistaken, has become the party

of self-sacrifice. The doctrine of indefeasible hereditary right was unknown to the Fathers, to early Councils, and to the schoolmen. It is virtually rejected by our own Hooker, and as completely by the mass of Roman Catholics, as, *e.g.*, the Spaniard Balmez. It grew up in England under the Stuarts, and with the aid of some Caroline divines; in France under Louis XIV., being much countenanced by Bossuet. But the Jacobites, however illogical they became in the end, must deserve honour for the costly devotedness of life and fortune displayed by so many for so long a period. It must go to the credit side of Macaulay that he has written a touching epitaph over one of those numerous exiles. In this matter, as in many others, Scott's poetic sympathies were on the one side, his reason on the other. He professed to yield entirely to Hanoverian claims when the last male Stuart died. And yet, as Lockhart remarks, he must have known perfectly well that, if the Stuart claims were good at all, they must have been as valid for heirs female as for heirs male in a country which knew no Salic law.

Scotland, in most things more intense than England, was still, in Scott's day, intense in its feudalism. Scott retained something of that exaggerated deference to rank and station which he describes in his father in *Redgauntlet*. Minor assailants of Scott in Edinburgh—they were at one time pretty numerous—used to declare that, while he had little mercy for the pompousness of a baronet, he always yielded to the prestige which surrounds the coronet of an earl. Certain it is that the foibles of Sir Robert Hazlewood in *Guy Mannering* meet with no mercy, but in the *Antiquary* there is an air of hushed deference when the Earl of Glenallan steps in, though it must in fairness be allowed that in his case a great part of that deference may be assigned to the deep and tragic story of this nobleman's career.

In Scott's days the Tory party was no longer, like the Jacobite one, the party of self-sacrifice. On the contrary, it had got a firm grasp upon the prizes of public life—peerages, judgeships, places in the Excise, and so forth; the self-sacrificers were now the youthful Whigs, whose opinions came out in that journal, with its Foxite covers of buff and blue, still known as the *Edinburgh Review*. That *Review* wrought much for good government and for good literature, though not without some serious drawbacks; its excessive anti-Wordsworthism, its contempt for missions, and, indeed, for all religious enthusiasm, were as prominent as its zeal for much-needed reforms.

an a
anot
The
tions
inclu
T
The
tician
all m
as th
dition
conce
Euro
be gi
Duke
Louis
B
of the
a pro
Britis
in pea
the co
W
Amier
he be
It is s
or Ali
above
of the
ville.
some
had be
a large
objecti
sistent
despite
It i
to live
war, w
a case
on the
while
exultat
their ju

But these elements might not have induced Scott to take an active part in founding the rival *Quarterly Review*, had not another cause of division between the two great parties arisen. The rise of Napoleon brought about one of those complications in the world of politics, which have not yet, we are inclined to think, been fairly treated.

The war against France in 1793, was it a mistake or not? The writer once asked this question of a leading Liberal politician. His reply was, 'I think that it was a mistake; but of all mistakes one of the most natural and excusable.' So far as the Tory party made restoration of the Bourbons a condition of peace, so far it was asking from another country a concession which England would never have yielded to any European nation; and how completely such a theory had to be given up was shown in 1830, when the Tory Minister, the Duke of Wellington, only took three days to acknowledge Louis-Philippe as *Roi des Français*.

But the rise of Napoleon greatly changed the complexion of the case; it was no longer the war of a Monarchy against a proselytising Republic, but a duel à *outrance* between the British Monarchy and a modern Cæsar, most able in war as in peace, and blending the ardour of revolutionary force with the comparative stability of a despotism.

Was Napoleon sincere, say at the time of the Peace of Amiens, in his overtures for peace; and, if he were so, could he be trusted as a chieftain who would keep his plighted word? It is strange in our day to read, not in the pages of Southey or Alison, but in those of foreign writers such as M. Taine and, above all, of M. Lanfrey, an entire acceptance of the justice of the case then made on behalf of England by Lord Grenville. The reaction against Napoleon may at this moment be somewhat excessive; but if on the one hand the Tory party had been unreasonable in pressing the claims of the Bourbons, a large section of the Whig party, who had been consistent in objecting to the original breach of peace, became sadly inconsistent when they continued to treat the case as unaltered, despite the position and character of Napoleon.

It is a sad and trying thing for any man or any set of men to live in an epoch when their own country is engaged in a war, which they believe to be mistaken and unjust. In such a case a religious man is tempted to look upon every failure on the part of his countrymen as a just judgment from above; while more worldly characters find it hard to refrain from exultation at what seems to them a proof of the soundness of their judgment.

We know that the great opponent of the war, Fox, died after all while making strenuous efforts for a continuance of the struggle, and received on that ground almost exclusively a poetic tribute from Scott. But now at length we perceive a consciousness of the false position adopted by a large portion of the Liberals of that day. We do not bind ourselves to the theories of Professor Goldwin Smith, but we are glad to see that—unlike Mr. Cobden and many others—he always draws a clear distinction between the war against the French Republic and the continuance of that war as against Napoleon, and that he condemns on this head the earlier part of the career of Charles James Fox. Such admissions have seldom been made, although Byron, in a moment of unwonted good humour, did speak of himself as one who must still love many British customs—

‘And greatly venerate our recent glories,
And wish they were not owing to the Tories.’

But such was not the course of the *Edinburgh Review*. We believe we are right in saying that it never lost an opportunity of exulting, more or less openly, over the failure of any of England's efforts to resist the domination of Napoleon—as in the well-known instance of the expedition of Sir John Moore. After the escape from Elba, an article in the *Edinburgh* announces with evident delight that ‘Napoleon Buonaparte is once more in Paris;’ and the reviewer proceeds to express a hope that no fresh efforts will be made to turn him out again. It is, we believe, beyond doubt that a further article insisting on the folly, and wrongheadedness, and almost certain failure of further attempts to overthrow the Emperor was ready, and even in type. But a small event, commonly known as the battle of Waterloo, occurred in time to render the publication of this article impossible, and its place is understood to have been supplied by an essay on a less exciting subject—to wit, Phrenology.

Now Scott had the most keen sympathy with the war against Napoleon; not only did he employ his pen, but (since he could not serve in the regular army) was duly drilled in one of those corps of yeomanry which, it was hoped, would resist invasion. If some of the less noble phases of Conservatism can be found in Scott, it is fair to say that much of his homage was rendered to worthy objects, and to good specimens of the Upper Ten. His martial feelings were another elevating element, and doubtless added vigour to his pulses as a man of letters, and stimulated the fire of his imagination.

It is
Great
and u
Æsch
battle
than
which
W
we th
less fo
our fal
ness in
tolerat
thorou
centur
Deism
charita
unlike
creeds.
but th
practic
monly
No
religion
do not
except
unwise
laxity
from th
Englan
Britain
Ramsa
by two
both o
Robert
rates in
that in
how m
of Rom
tianity
quote a
is mad
which
triumph
writes

It is no dishonour to his natural powers to insist on this. Greater men than he have enjoyed the same good fortune, and used it as freely. Æschylus would not have been Æschylus had he not mingled in, as well as described, the battle of Salamis; and Shakespeare would have been other than he was, if he had not lived in such stirring times as those which witnessed the destruction of the Armada.

When we come to the question of religion, Scott must, we think, humanly speaking, be pronounced to have been less fortunate. Christendom has not yet discovered—will our fallen race ever discover?—the way to reconcile earnestness in religion with anything like a large-hearted spirit of toleration. The sixteenth and seventeenth centuries were thoroughly in earnest, but fearfully intolerant; the eighteenth century, to a great extent, folded its arms, fell back upon Deism, and announced, especially in France, how delightfully charitable the *Philosophes* would prove in power, and how unlike those who had fought a thirty-years' war over their creeds. They attained their wish, and did get into power, but their professions do not seem to have been ratified in practice, as the period of their greatest dominion is commonly known as the Reign of Terror.

Now Scott was born at an epoch when the lamp of religious enthusiasm burnt dimly almost everywhere. We do not, of course, mean that there were not many remarkable exceptions; but, as a rule, side by side with intense and often unwise strictness on the part of the few, there existed great laxity in the many. It would be easy to bring proofs of this from the annals of France or Italy, as well as from those of England; but we must at present confine ourselves to North Britain. Scott suffered from both extremes. The late Dean Ramsay, we have heard, was fond of illustrating the lax side by two specimens of written or spoken utterance, one or both of which he afterwards put into print. Principal Robertson was, we know, the leader of the so-called Moderates in Edinburgh, and we must do him the justice to say that in his *Charles V.* he anticipated Macaulay in describing how much good the Reformation had wrought for the Church of Rome. But his ideas concerning the essentials of Christianity must surely have been vague. Dean Ramsay used to quote a letter of the Principal to Gibbon, in which reference is made to those insidious chapters of the *Decline and Fall* which represent the victory over heathenism as a mere triumph of human skill and arrangement. 'You are aware,' writes Robertson to his friend, 'that some *ultra*-Christians

object to your representation of this matter.' The idea that it required to be an *ultra*-Christian to object to a theory which would place Christianity on a level with any ingenious political scheme, and positively below Judaism, or perhaps even Mahometanism! The Dean's other illustration was of a different character. Early in this century a lady in Edinburgh was mentioning in society a report, which had greatly exercised and astonished the minds of some of its prominent members. The following is the report in question, and the comment made upon it. 'I hear that Sir Henry Dukinfield, the new commander of the forces in Scotland, has family prayers in his house morning and evening.' 'Oh, Miss B., how can you go about saying such things?—only the ill-natured stories of Montrose!' The idea that a military officer of high rank, and a baronet to boot, was addicted to what would be looked upon as a methodistical practice, was really regarded as a grave scandal.

Now Scott may have been really deficient in the religious fibre. He would certainly have never dreamt, like Milton, of attempting a poem 'to justify the ways of God to men'; and his Italian studies, though they led him to delight in Ariosto, left him, as he confesses, untouched and uninterested by Dante. But the stricter side of the national religion had also its own trials for him. The words of Lockhart have often been quoted. He speaks of Scott as being 'among the many who have incurred considerable risk' of unbelief from the sternness of that guise in which piety was exhibited to him during his early years.¹ Scott was not only lax as a churchgoer, as we have already observed, but he seems really unable—though allowing for the effects of religious zeal in troublous times—to enter into and understand the position of statesmen, or public men of any kind, who should really make their religious principles the guiding star of their national as well as of their domestic career. We shall have occasion to recur to this subject presently.

III. And now, what was the influence of Scott upon his own age? Perhaps we are not even yet quite able to judge this problem fairly, but it surely must have been very con-

¹ Lockhart proceeds to show how Scott 'took up, early in life, a repugnance to the mode in which public worship is conducted in the Scottish Establishment,' and how he found refuge in the Church 'whose system of government and discipline he believed to be the fairest copy of the primitive polity, and whose litanies and collects he revered as having been transmitted to us from the age immediately succeeding that of the Apostles.'

sider
have
do not
of Fé
If sul
Scott-
De Vi
certain
not S
impress
affect
Thack
his la
someh
suspec
Balzac
lowing
affected
admits
Arnold
livelier
in *The*
broad
lessons
in bec
called
and su
allusive
Scottsm
be call

It
portrai
to be t
details,
research
paper v
gint as
or thri
as array
does in
in this
of the i
a featur
best an

siderable. To begin with, can the historical novel be said to have had any real existence before the time of Scott? We do not forget the *Cyropædia* of Xenophon or the *Télémaque* of Fénelon, but there is here no real ground of comparison. If subsequent writers, as some maintain, have surpassed Scott—there are those who would mention the *Cing Mars* of De Vigny or George Eliot's *Romola*—still it remains all but certain that such books would never have been written, had not Scott led the van. He was the first, we believe, to impress on us the way in which great public events may affect the entire life of comparatively insignificant individuals. Thackeray writes: 'Yes, Napoleon Buonaparte is throwing his last great stake, and little Emma Sedley's happiness somehow forms a part of it.' But Thackeray did not, we suspect, derive this touch from his studies of Fielding or of Balzac; he, in company with Dumas, was here simply following the tracks of Scott. And Scott's mode of observation affected not merely novelists, but historians, as even Carlyle admits. 'I know not how it may be with others,' said Dr. Arnold, 'but I myself always seem to have conceived a livelier idea of James I. since reading those humorous scenes in *The Fortunes of Nigel* which remind us that he spoke broad Scotch.'¹ Macaulay was one of those who wisely took lessons from Scott in this respect, and who also rivalled him in becoming a master of that style which, if it cannot be called in the highest degree suggestive—as that of Coleridge and such like thinkers—may fairly claim to be remarkably allusive. And yet Macaulay, with one still more eminent Scotsman, is in the small list of distinguished men who may be called the assailants of Scott.

It may also be asked whether, in many cases, Scott's portraiture of famous characters and epochs may not prove to be to a very large extent a correct one. He is careless in details, and even makes mistakes which our progress in research renders occasionally a little ludicrous. A newspaper writer of our day would hardly speak of the Septuagint as a *Latin* translation of the Bible, as Scott does twice or thrice. Nor would he represent a mediæval dignitary as arraying himself in a cope for supper, as Prior Aylmer does in *Ivanhoe*. Palgrave points out other mistaken details in this same tale, and Mr. Green seems to deny the existence of the intense persecution of the Jews which forms so marked a feature of the narrative. But, on the whole, as one of the best and most lovable of Scottish antiquaries used frequently

¹ *Lectures on Modern History.*

to maintain, have we not a fairly faithful picture of the men of thought and the men of action in that age? If the picture of Richard be too favourable, John is surely the real John as known to us in more regular history.

Take a more thorny question. Claverhouse is the demon of Scottish legend. He is the Knight *sans peur et sans reproche* of Aytoun and the late Sheriff Mark Napier. May not Scott's be a juster view than that of either of them? If *Old Mortality* as an entire picture be criticized, let it at least be compared with the canvas of such conspicuous Presbyterians as the late Norman McLeod and the present Professor of Divinity in the University of Edinburgh. Neither Macaulay nor Carlyle seem to have done themselves much good by their assaults on their distinguished fellow-countryman. We must not, however, allow vexation at the tone of their writing to blind us to the justice of some portions of their criticism.

Scott had his faults, both as a man and an author. He was, as we have admitted, too much bent on the acquisition of land and its surroundings, and we shall have occasion to maintain further on that he did not always seem to possess in any very eminent degree what our neighbours would call 'the courage of his opinions.' Mr. Carlyle is also justified in observing that, for a writer who has left us so much, he is one of the least often quoted; and it must be owned that this feature, combined with the want of distinct purpose, and with the limitations to which we have already referred, must prevent Scott from occupying a place in the *very* highest rank of literature. It is fair, once more, to remember, in passing, that he never for one moment presumed to claim it for himself.

But even Carlyle admits that nowhere do we find fresher paintings of nature than Scott's; hardly anywhere a wider sympathy with man. Is this a small matter? If our recreation has left us not merely amused, but also endued with larger capacities of admiration, with extended sympathy for our fellow-creatures, with more tolerance and charity towards humanity in general—then, such recreation, if we have not bestowed too much time upon it, has at any rate not been an injurious one, but thoroughly the reverse. Even Jeffrey, not a critic too partial to Scott, has in a well-known passage contrasted the kindness of feeling left in our hearts towards many at whom Scott makes us smile, as compared with the bitter insinuations and the vilifications of humanity that too often proceeded from the pen of Byron. One point, indeed, the two authors have in common. The names of both stand

among
British
Nor
being v
words
shaken
authors
truth, i
purchas
writing
is to b
feelings
these v
Fall, an
popular
any fou

And
professi
us the
same p
intellect
that thi
the cap
worth o
fore the
and our
vinced
with hi
wise in
effect is
magistr
in St. A
half-bro
of any
replies:
your le
even w
importa

Nass
Stanley
Andrew
Goethe
think—
and as a
that Car

among the few who have achieved continental as well as British celebrity.

Nor can we omit what may seem like negative merits as being wholly valueless. Scott said—if we remember his words aright—‘I have corrupted no man’s morals; I have shaken no man’s faith.’ Alas! how long is the list of great authors who could not possibly, with any approximation to truth, indulge in such an utterance! ‘How dearly shall we purchase the pleasure and instruction to be derived from his writings,’ said Professor Smyth of a great historian, ‘if modesty is to be sneered away from our minds and piety from our feelings!’ Carlyle knew only too well how much truth lay in these words as applied to the historian of the *Decline and Fall*, and he lived to discover that one at least of the most popular of Gibbon’s countless sneers was absolutely devoid of any foundation in truth.

Another feature in Scott—and this he derived from his professional experience—is the way in which he brings before us the utterly different effect upon different minds of the same pieces of evidence. Perhaps, in ordinary life, few intellectual mistakes are more common than the conviction that this document or that piece of conduct has proved to us the capacity or the honesty of such and such a person, the worth of such an institution, or the reverse; and that therefore they must needs prove the same alike to all our opponents and our friends. Edward Waverley, for example, is convinced that the seemingly trifling coincidences connected with his ride from Glennaquoich southward would in no wise interfere with his progress; but an entirely opposite effect is produced upon the judgment of the Hanoverian magistrate, Major Melville of Cairnvreckan. Lord Etherington in *St. Ronan’s Well* is confident that a letter concerning his half-brother is a calm statement, which will show the absence of any *animus* towards that relative; but Captain Jekyl replies: ‘I detect your hatred to this man in every line of your letter, even when you write with the greatest coolness; even where there is an affectation of gaiety.’ It is an important lesson, and one that we are all constantly needing.

Nassau Senior, John Keble, John Henry Newman, Dean Stanley, Mr. Bagehot, Mr. Hutton, Professor Palgrave, Mr. Andrew Lang (to say nothing of *non-British* critics from Goethe to Hawthorne), have thought—and the living ones still think—that Scott is worth some study, both as an author and as a man. There seems to be a widely-spread impression that Carlyle’s assault was overdone. Carlyle maintains in his

celebrated *critique* that Lockhart by his biography was summoning 'the whole world's attention round Scott, *probably for the last time it will ever be so summoned.*' This does not seem to have been a true prediction. It is at least now summoned once again, and, for our part, we utterly refuse to believe that it is for the last time.

On Macaulay's briefer and less serious attack we say little. It is contained in a private letter written to the editor of the *Edinburgh Review* in 1838,¹ to show cause why Macaulay should not undertake a *critique* of Lockhart's biography. Such a protest was almost sure to bring out a strong statement of what the writer thought objectionable in Scott's character, and he would hardly pause at such a moment to think how much he himself might be indebted to the man whom he was assailing. We must not forget that Macaulay, like Carlyle, does at least say one good word for the object of his dislike. It is Carlyle who tells us of the little dog in Edinburgh—a dog in general alarmingly shy of strangers—who, on several occasions, with most truthful instinct, ran up and fawned upon Walter Scott; and it is Macaulay, most severe on the politician and on the objects of Scott's labours, who yet admits that 'hardly any writer of note has been so free from the petty jealousies and morbid irritabilities of our [literary] caste.'

That attention to which Carlyle referred is, as we have intimated, summoned at least once again by the courtesy of Scott's great granddaughter, the Hon. Mrs. Maxwell Scott, and by her wise choice of an editor of the complete Journal, which Lockhart had in his hands, but rightly forbore to use in full. The omissions of Lockhart were fully warranted by the fact which he mentioned, that certain portions might give pain to persons yet living. Lockhart, however, occasionally did more than this—he altered the language of the Journal in order to make it more strictly grammatical. We agree with our contemporary the *Athenæum*, which last autumn called attention to this circumstance, that Lockhart's alterations were not improvements. That his Oxford training may have rendered him more of a purist in language than Scott is very possible, but a slight *abandon* in a journal is not without its charm, and that charm was sure to be lessened by the operation of the critical pruning-knife.

Mr. David Douglas, the editor, has performed his task most admirably, never intruding himself, but explaining

¹ *Life and Letters of Lord Macaulay*, by Sir George Trevelyan, chap. vii.

almost
own lite
now, al
explana
anything

Just
we trust
note¹ to
we will
Mr. Do

The
are slight
feelings
famous
palliatio
own rec
and as '
they sto
have O
to South
horror
towards
in bearin
occasion
agents v
out, tho
had befo
the Cov
biograph
treating
but mos
was cert
whatever
tions, 7
had a ca

¹ Scott
the only
require to
understood
to be used
the king a
been exp
Highlands
friends.'

² See
'Burial M

almost every allusion and making full use not only of his own literary stores, but of his intimacy with friends of Scott, now, alas! almost all departed. He has given sufficient explanation to enable us to understand the Journal, without anything like overloading the book with notes.

Just to show that we have read these papers carefully, and we trust in an independent frame of mind, we refer in a footnote¹ to almost the only *lacuna*, if such it can be called; and we will venture to intimate a slight amount of dissent from Mr. Douglas' conclusion on one somewhat thorny question.

The delicate problem in which, not without diffidence, we are slightly at variance with Mr. Douglas, relates to Scott's feelings and convictions respecting the Covenanters. In a famous letter of his early days Scott, writing to Southey, and palliating Claverhouse, speaks of the Covenanters as in their own records bearing tremendous witness against themselves, and as 'being only entitled to the name of men inasmuch as they stood upon two legs.' At a considerably later date we have *Old Mortality*. The merely one-sided view of the letter to Southey is here decidedly modified; the reader's just horror is excited by exhibitions of the cruelty exercised towards Covenanting martyrs, and their wonderful fortitude in bearing it. Still, their fanaticism and intolerance, and the occasional treachery displayed by some of those inferior agents who are to be found in most parties, are fully brought out, though Scott has not given the record which Aytoun² had before him of the number of gentlemen's houses burnt by the Covenanters. However, Dr. McCrie, the well-known biographer of Knox, composed and published a small volume treating with some severity the Waverley Novels in general, but most especially *Old Mortality*. McCrie's literary taste was certainly questionable. For example, he could see nothing whatever to admire in one of Scott's very finest compositions, *The Antiquary*; but as regards the Covenanters he had a case, and he urged it with courage and ability. Perhaps

¹ Scott somewhere ends a day's remarks with the words, 'and that is the only way of accounting between friends.' English readers may require to be reminded that these words are a quotation. William III. is understood to have given to the Earl of Breadalbane the sum of 30,000*l.*, to be used for the pacification of the Scottish Highlands. After a time the king asked for a statement of the manner in which this money had been expended. His lordship replied: 'The money is spent and the Highlands are quiet, and that is the only way of accounting between friends.' His correspondent wisely abstained from further inquiry.

² See *Lays of the Scottish Cavaliers*; preface and notes to the 'Burial March of Dundee.'

its general drift in the way of apology may be briefly expressed in the language of a very different writer—the German Möhler—that ‘if you drive people to despair, you must expect the language of despair.’ McCrie fully admitted that certain tenets of the Covenanters, however capable of palliation under the circumstances, were in themselves indefensible.

Such a man, in such a cause, was sure to find listeners in Scotland. The still unknown author of *Waverley* at first told some of the few friends who were in the secret that he did not mean to read McCrie’s small volume. But he saw reason to change his mind. In due time a sort of half-and-half defence, mixed with considerable concessions, appeared in the *Quarterly Review*; and there is little doubt, we fear, but that Scott had a considerable share in the composition of this article. Later on, in the *Tales of a Grandfather*, the entire account of the struggle depicted in *Old Mortality* is narrated in a very different manner—in fact, in a way far more calculated, we will not say to gratify McCrie, but, at any rate, to convince him that he had not written in vain.

Now Mr. David Douglas seems to hold that this change on Scott’s part was simply the result of fair study, and at length represented a settled conviction. We wish that we could here follow Mr. Douglas; but, though it may be ascribed to Episcopalian prejudice, we must own frankly that we are unable to do so. Scott, who on many matters (*e.g.* in politics) was often outspoken to a fault, and grievously irritated his opponents, displayed at moments upon certain themes a degree of caution and reticence which reminds one of his father as he appears in *Redgauntlet*, under the name of Alexander Fairford.

For example, most eminent writers are almost of necessity very conscious of the faults of their own race and country. Dante’s intense love for Italy cannot save his Florentines from the severest satire, because their practice fell so far short of his ideal. Giusti and Azeglio often followed in Dante’s wake; and even Shakespeare’s glorification of ‘this precious stone set in the silver sea’ does not wholly blind him to the faults of his beloved England. Scott, in his turn, too, was conscious that there were Scotsmen, both in the past and the present, who did not exhibit to other nations the best qualities of their countrymen. But almost invariably, when he thinks it his duty to say a word on the defects or follies of his compatriots, he places the censure in the mouth of some scoundrel, such as Rashleigh Osbaldistone or the Earl of Etherington.

No
a subje
nation,
in path
Scott t
a sad l
terian v
in the
Scott i
Pleyde
thinks
the Sco
‘Why,
thinkin
of the s
of a sh
here rep
calls hi
can eve
siders t
conditi
and one
change
part, we
have be
of Scott
come in
when he
he feare

This
we have
editor o
now cor
on Scott
us to be
when L
pointed
Great M
mixed u
this; bu
before c
struggle
And as I
homage

Now there is one subject on which he is specially reticent—a subject on which Johnson (so far inferior to Scott in imagination, in range of sympathy, in capacity for admiration, and in pathos) might, in part at least, have been an example for Scott to follow. Johnson is, of course, usually stigmatised as a sad bigot for his non-attendance in Scotland on Presbyterian worship; but, at any rate, whether in Fleet Street or in the Canongate, he always had the courage of his opinions. Scott is supposed to represent himself to a certain extent in Pleydell; and when Guy Mannering asks Pleydell what he thinks of the points of difference between the two parties in the Scottish Establishment, he receives the following reply: 'Why, I hope, Colonel, a plain man may go to heaven without thinking about them at all; besides, *inter nos*, I am a member of the suffering and Episcopal Church of Scotland—the shadow of a shade now, and fortunately so.' Now, if Pleydell does here represent Scott, Scott has already become what Lockhart calls him—an Episcopalian; but it is to be *inter nos*; and he can even bring himself to call it fortunate, that what he considers the better way is in this persecuted and downtrodden condition. Another commentator, possibly a rather extreme and one-sided one, assigns a very different ground for Scott's change of opinion regarding the Covenanters. For our own part, we are far from thinking it impossible that there may have been some real honest change in this matter on the part of Scott. But we also do fear that another element may have come in, and that Mr. Mark Napier was not wholly wrong when he asserted that 'popularity was Scott's bank, and that he feared to break it.'¹

This, however, is the only point on which we feel, and, as we have said, with diffidence, a disposition to differ from the editor of these noble volumes. They may not, even in their now complete form, revolutionize the judgment to be passed on Scott, but in so far as they modify it, the change seems to us to be wholly in his favour. Some literary young men, when Lockhart's *Life* first appeared, were a little disappointed to find that one whom they knew simply as the Great Magician had been so smitten with land-hunger and so mixed up with affairs of trade. The Journal cannot alter this; but it does bring out, with fuller power and pathos than before could be realised, how keen in all its details was the struggle for Scott, how grand his almost isolated position. And as Lear, disrowned and a wanderer, wins from us that homage and affection which we cannot pay to him before his

¹ Napier's *Life of Dundee*.

troubles have begun, so, as regards Scott, we can heartily adopt the judgment of a contemporary :

'We find more that is sublime in a dauntless conflict with apparently hopeless odds than we do in an overwhelming greatness. More or less of struggle, more or less of suffering, more or less of strain, is essential to the full idea of sublimity. It is not mere power, but power at full stretch ; it is not mere victory, but victory of which you can count the cost and see the difficulty which most effectively conveys to us the notion of sublimity. Sir Walter Scott, with Death in his house, and not only in his house, but plainly warning himself that for him, too, he is waiting at the door, yet none the less labouring away from morning till night in the cause of his creditors, that he may clear his name of all stain, is more sublime than Sir Walter Scott, in the full tide of genius and prosperity, throwing off one great work after another with the ease of gigantic and unconscious power.'¹

Apart from this one central idea, there remains a great deal in the Journal that is full of interest. Minor details, even playful ones, have their own shade of pathos ; but it is wonderful to remark how this Diary, which was suggested by a similar one of Byron's, remains throughout, most happily, thoroughly anti-Byronic in its tone.

Take a single specimen. Scott finds himself in extreme loneliness at Abbotsford, and declares—we doubt not, most conscientiously—that he can enjoy it as he did in boyhood ; but he adds :

'This is a feeling without the least tinge of misanthropy, which I always consider as a kind of blasphemy of a shocking description. If God bears with the very worst of us, we may surely endure each other. If thrown into society, I always have, and always will endeavour to bring pleasure with me—at least, to show willingness to please' (vol. i. p. 64).

The same page furnishes a specimen of a less serious nature. Scott has been reading a novel (by a then anonymous gentleman) called *Granby*. It attempts to describe the actual current of society, and here is the great novelist's comment : 'The women do this better : Edgeworth, Ferrier, Austen have all had their portraits of real society, far superior to anything man, vain man, has produced of the like nature.'

Inter alia, Scott's fondness for dogs, hinted at in *The Lay* and in *Woodstock*, is again and again brought before us. When he thinks that he must lose Abbotsford and will never go down there again, he writes :

'My dogs will wait for me in vain. It is foolish, but the thoughts

¹ *Spectator*, January 3, 1891.

of part
any of
must g
me, ma

Th
called
pensab
Certain
seen in
extraor
both to
thorough
say not
there is
indirect

than on
underly
There i
rememb
in Runi
asked w
justly re
first lov
tenderes
the Last
public r
Melville
magnate
splenetic
duel with
should r
in the ca
man of
his duty
of Wellin
Scott
Majores
enjoyed
tainments
It was no
were exc
their diff

¹ See, fo
Vol. i.
Peak, and
VOL. X.

of parting from these dumb creatures have moved me more than any of the painful reflections I have put down. Poor things, I must get them kind masters; there may be yet those who, loving me, may love my dog because it has been mine.'

The Journal (or, as Scott's favourite daughter playfully called it, *The Gurnal*), will in its present form prove indispensable to any who desire to make a real study of Scott. Certain marked features, of course, they may have already seen in Lockhart's *Life*. Such are, by way of example, the extraordinary receptions given to Scott during his latest visits both to London and to Paris—receptions which might have thoroughly spoilt a man of less well-balanced mind. But (to say nothing of fresh details now for the first time given us) there is an abundance of interesting matter both directly and indirectly affecting our judgment of Scott. There is more than one indication of his sense of the tragedy that is often underlying the apparently smooth surface of general society.¹ There is his latest visit to St. Andrews, wherein he says: 'I remembered the name I then [thirty-four years earlier] carved in Runic characters on the turf beside the Castle-gate, and I asked why it should still agitate my heart.' This, as the editor justly remarks, 'is not the only allusion in the Journal to his first love, that innocent attachment to which we owe the tenderest pages, not only of *Redgauntlet*, but of the *Lay of the Last Minstrel* and of *Rokeby*.'² There are notices of many public men of the day, as of the Great Duke, of the Lord Melville and the Lord Dalhousie of that time, besides the magnates of London and Paris, always interesting, and never splenetic or ill-natured. There is more about the risk of a duel with General Gourgaud, concerning which the reader should remember that even Johnson had defended duelling in the case of the person challenged, and that a really devout man of Scott's day, the then Earl of Winchilsea, thought it his duty to incur the risks of such an encounter with the Duke of Wellington.

Scott remained to the last on friendly terms with the *Dii Majores* of Scottish Whiggism; nay, he confesses to having enjoyed a dinner with some of them even more than entertainments given exclusively by members of his own party. It was not only, it seems, that men like Cockburn and Jeffrey were excellent conversationalists; but the very knowledge of their differences, combined with a studious endeavour on

¹ See, for instance, vol. i. p. 303.

² Vol. i. p. 404. Must we not assign some pages of *Peveril of the Peak*, and some other tales, to the same influence?

both sides to be courteous, added somewhat to the piquancy of such gatherings.

It might have been well for some of his great friends across the Channel if they could have read and pondered such remarks as the following, which Scott penned at Paris in 1826:

'The most dangerous point in the present state of France is that of religion. It is, no doubt, excellent in the Bourbons to desire to make France a religious country; but they begin, I think, at the wrong end. To press the observances and ritual of religion on those who are not influenced by its doctrines is planting the growing tree with its head downwards. Rites are sanctified by belief; but belief can never arise out of an enforced observance of ceremonies—it only makes men detest what is imposed on them by compulsion.'

During all this time Scott's work has been increasing, and he has cleared off so much of the 113,000*l.* due, that a few years more of health must have, humanly speaking, ensured its complete payment.

These are but a few specimens of the wealth of the volumes before us, to which, after all, we must be content to refer our readers for their own delectation. Lockhart maintains that the general tone of Scott's writings did much to neutralize the effect of the Reform Bill of 1832. Certain it is, as Lord Beaconsfield was fond of pointing out, that a Conservative reaction did follow in an extraordinarily short space of time, and it is perfectly possible that Scott may have been one of the agents in producing it. Yet many, even of those who may believe the Act of 1832 to have been desirable and inevitable, may also be ready to admit that it is well that the other side of the case should have found instruments of utterance, and thus have led to what Lord Lindsay called 'progression by antagonism.'

Of another writer of fiction, different in all the circumstances of life, and viewing the world from a very opposite standpoint, it has been said: 'Dickens does not seem to believe in sanctification, the goodness of his best characters is simply natural goodness.' A man theologically trained, on hearing this remark, replied: 'Well, that is true; but nevertheless I always feel the better for having read a book by Dickens.' A third speaker added: 'Is it possible that the very fact of the absence of one feature may have added to the intensity of others, and that we all need to be reminded of the human side of our religion from time to time?' Something like this may perhaps be urged with reference also to the works of Scott; and let it be observed that though he does not seem to have

reco
all
igno
illne
fatal
press
Rede
so to
V
of Sc
the a
was
depe
takes
dying
when
worse
we c
words
'Adie
and s
honou
at lar
time h

1. The
2. A
18

THE J
just be
of 'col
working
the pr
announ
it is saf

¹ Mr
Words f
Stanley
purity, an
Walter S

recognised religion as the potent factor that it ought to be in all life, social, professional, and political, yet that he never ignored it in solemn moments of his own existence. A critical illness when he was only forty-eight seemed likely to prove fatal; he then took a solemn farewell of his children, expressed his reliance on the merits and intercession of his Redeemer, gave them a farewell blessing, and enjoined them so to live that all might meet again hereafter.¹

We have not wished to ignore the defects and limitations of Scott, either as author or as man; but when we think of the age in which he lived, of the temptations with which he was surrounded, of his relations to family, friends, humble dependants, and strangers, of the many opportunities for mistakes, of the few falls, and of the noble struggle waged with dying hand against the consequences of his mistakes to others; when we think of the many less tried who have been so far worse, of the few who under such an ordeal have done better, we can close with something more than the half-relenting words of his severest critic, Thomas Carlyle. Carlyle wrote: 'Adieu, Sir Walter, pride of all Scotchmen, take our proud and sad farewell.' We hold that we may claim him as an honour, not only to his well-loved native land, but to humanity at large, and we cannot but believe that it will be a long, long time before such a farewell is to be identified with oblivion.

ART. VI.—THE POETRY OF MR. LEWIS MORRIS.

1. *The Works of Lewis Morris.* (London, 1890.)
2. *A Vision of Saints.* By LEWIS MORRIS. (London, 1890.)

THE juxtaposition of the two volumes whose names have just been written is in itself a speaking witness of the futility of 'collected editions' of a writer who is still living and working. It is, however, a habit of increasing frequency at the present time. Whenever the Laureate's publisher announces a new complete edition of Lord Tennyson's works, it is safe to look out for an advertisement of a fresh volume

¹ Mr. Dennis has rightly called attention to this scene (see *Good Words* for December 1890, p. 817). He also quotes the eulogy of Dean Stanley on 'the profound reverence, the lofty sense of Christian honour, purity, and justice that breathe through every volume of the romances of Walter Scott.'

which is to follow shortly. Sometimes the result is highly inconvenient, as when Mr. Browning, after being neatly concluded in sixteen volumes, died, in the act of issuing to the world a small collection of poems, which might be about equal to half of one of the aforesaid sixteen volumes, but which could in no way be made to constitute a seventeenth member of the set. We hope that no such misfortune may happen in the case of Mr. Lewis Morris; but here, side by side with the first collected edition of his works, is a new volume which is of considerable importance in relation to his position as a poet, and which the purchasers of the *Works* will not possess.

But we are less concerned here with Mr. Morris's publishers than with his poetry. Ten years ago, if the average reader of poetry had been asked which of the younger generation of poets showed most signs of becoming fit successors of the great masters whose work was nearly finished, it is probable that he would have named the author of *The Light of Asia* and the author of *The Epic of Hades*. The same answer would hardly be given now. Neither writer has, in the interval since that time, produced any work which is in advance of that by which he first achieved popularity. Both seemed to be letting the years slip by without fulfilling the promise which their earlier volumes showed. But this year there are signs of increased poetical activity on the part of both, and while Mr. Lewis Morris has published a volume of greater importance than any which has proceeded from him since *The Epic of Hades*, a work of at least equal interest and importance issues from the pen of Sir Edwin Arnold, as we pass these pages through the press. And, by a curious coincidence, both volumes directly challenge comparison with the earlier poems by which these authors are best known, and in both cases the newer work finds its inspiration in the religion of Christianity. Sir Edwin Arnold has told the story of the *Light of Asia*, and he now attempts—we wish we could say successfully—a far more difficult and dangerous subject in the story of the *Light of the World*. Mr. Lewis Morris has put into verse the legends of the heroes and heroines, both human and divine, of the Greek mythology, and he now places beside them the heroes and heroines of the Christian history. This is a work which seems to demand notice, and it may be interesting to attempt at the same time to form some estimate of the position which Mr. Morris holds in contemporary English poetry.

Before discussing in detail the work which he has from time to time given to the world in the course of the last

eigh
sary,
which
its ex
poetic
nence,
with r
to the
prime
art, th
in a G
of the
pathet
followi
(and in
to take

eighteen years, some preliminary considerations seem necessary, because critics differ not a little as to the qualities for which they look in poetry, and according to which they rate its excellence. Some writers of the present day will allow no poetical merit to verse which has, in any degree of prominence, a moral object, or which concerns itself at all largely with moral questions and considerations. Poetry, according to them, is not meant to teach but to please. Beauty is its prime object; the truth at which it should aim is truth to art, the perfection of symmetry and harmony, which we see in a Greek ode or statue. It finds its expression in poems of the fashion of Keats's *Ode on a Grecian Urn*, or Shelley's pathetic supplication *To Night*, or in such a little gem as the following, which, as it is less universally known than these two (and indeed of a different class), it may perhaps be legitimate to take the pleasure of quoting:—

' All the bells of heaven may ring,
All the birds of heaven may sing,
All the wells on earth may spring,
All the winds on earth may bring
 All sweet sounds together;
Sweeter far than all things heard,
Hand of harper, tone of bird,
Sound of woods at sundawn stirred,
Welling water's winsome word,
 Wind in warm wan weather.

One thing yet there is that none
Hearing ere its chime be done
Knows not well the sweetest one
Heard of men beneath the sun,
 Hoped in heaven hereafter;
Soft and strong and loud and light,
Very sound of very light
Heard from morning's rosiest height,
When the soul of all delight
 Fills a child's clear laughter.

Golden bells of welcome rolled
Never forth such notes, nor told
Hours so blithe in tones so bold,
As the radiant mouth of gold
 Here that rings forth heaven.

If the golden-crested wren
Were a nightingale—why, then,
Something seen and heard of men
Might be half as sweet as when
 Laughs a child of seven.¹

¹ *A Child's Laughter*, by A. C. Swinburne.

Now no one with a feeling for poetry would wish to depreciate verse such as this, or as much that might be gathered from the records of English poetry, and chiefly from such golden-mouthed singers as Spenser (and with him many a half-forgotten Elizabethan), Shelley, Keats, or Swinburne. The question is whether all poetry is to be judged according as it attains to this standard, and is to be condemned in proportion as it includes reflections on the moralities of life. If this principle is true, Mr. Lewis Morris would cease to have the smallest claim for consideration on the score of poetry; and not he alone, but many a greater writer with him. There is, no doubt, this truth in it, that purely didactic poetry is invariably dull and inevitably prosaic. The arid wastes which occupy so much of even so great poems as *The Prelude* and *The Excursion* testify of this for ever. But poetry, which is defined by Matthew Arnold as 'a criticism of life,' can deal with moralities without composing sermons. Would the critics of whom we are speaking cast out of their poetic Elysium such lines as Shakespeare's—

'The quality of mercy is not strained;
It droppeth, as the gentle dew from heaven
Upon the place beneath: it is twice bless'd;
It blesseth him that gives, and him that takes.'

or Sophocles's—

μη φῦναι τὸν ἅπαντα νι-
κᾶ λόγον· τὸ δ', ἐπεὶ φάνη,
βῆναι κείμεν ὄθεν περ ἦκει
πολὺ δεύτερον ὡς τάχιστα.'

or Wordsworth's—

'Stern Lawgiver! yet Thou dost wear
The Godhead's most benignant grace;
Nor know we anything so fair
As is the smile upon Thy face:
Flowers laugh before Thee on their beds
And fragrance in Thy footing treads;
Thou dost preserve the stars from wrong,
And the most ancient Heavens through Thee are fresh and strong';

or Shelley's—

'The One remains, the many change and pass;
Heaven's light for ever shines, Earth's shadows fly;
Life, like a dome of many-coloured glass,
Stains the white radiance of Eternity,
Until Death tramples it to fragments';

or, finally, Tennyson's—

The
cogniti
ness fr
perhaps
countri
Green h
he insta
'depend
"the ap
of poetr
of the K
Independ
not esca
doubt th
poem to
sentimen
may be
particle
poetical
sea and
truth lies
poetry in
aesthetic
has been
and even
not there
holiness'
thought.
harmony
the natur
to the mo
doubt as
to appear
poets wou
to fly in th
does so in
worth.
Therefo
of poet be
to put into

'I hold it true, whate'er befall;
 I feel it, when I sorrow most;
 'Tis better to have loved and lost
 Than never to have loved at all'?

The catholic lover of poetry cannot exclude from his recognition those passages which derive part of their attractiveness from the moral truths enshrined in them, and which are perhaps commoner in English verse than in that of other countries. On the contrary, so great a thinker as Prof. T. H. Green has observed that 'the highest poetry of our time' (and he instances particularly *In Memoriam* and *Rabbi Ben Ezra*) 'depends chiefly for its interest on what has well been called "the application of ideas to life."¹ And indeed a definition of poetry which excludes *In Memoriam* and much of the *Idylls of the King*, *Abt Vogler* and *Rabbi Ben Ezra*, *Resolution and Independence* and the *Ode on Intimations of Immortality*, cannot escape the charge of being partial and one-sided. No doubt there are many persons who enthusiastically declare a poem to be 'beautiful' if it contains a sufficiently trite moral sentiment, and it is perfectly true that a verse composition may be irreproachable in point of ethics and yet possess no particle of poetry; but neither is a song or sonnet necessarily poetical because it is composed of a free admixture of sun and sea and mountain, or of smiles and tears and kisses. The truth lies, as usual, in neither extreme. Moral truths are not poetry in themselves, but they are, just as much as artistic or æsthetic truths, fit materials for poetry. The aim of poetry has been declared, not once nor twice, to be Truth and Beauty; and even were it Beauty alone, the sphere of morals would not therefore be excluded from it. There is a 'beauty of holiness' as well as a beauty of physical form or imaginative thought. All beauty rests on a certain 'fitness' as a basis, a harmony or ordered arrangement which is in accordance with the nature of our universe; and this harmony belongs as truly to the moral as to the artistic world. And were there any doubt as to the theoretical explanation of the right of morals to appear in poetry, the practice of nearly all our greatest poets would decide the question. The poet can well afford to fly in the face of a school of contemporary criticism, who does so in company with Shakespeare and Milton and Wordsworth.

Therefore we shall not refuse Mr. Lewis Morris the title of poet because it is a marked characteristic of his writings to put into verse the ethical principles of common life, and to

¹ *Prolegomena to Ethics*, p. 1.

dwell with especial pleasure on the moral reflections which a story, whether it be of Greek mythology or modern Christianity, suggests to his mind. At the same time a distinction must be drawn. Some writers are poets' poets, others are popular poets. Some write for an audience fit but few; others desire above all things to be understood of the people. The greatest poets are both to some degree, but not to the same degree. Anyone who chooses to do so can enjoy Shakespeare and much of Milton; but not everyone can understand the charm of Spenser or of Shelley. And with poets of lesser rank the distinction becomes more marked. In every generation there is some writer to whom a small audience with a cultivated taste for poetry listens with keen enjoyment, while he is unknown to the multitude, who have a popular favourite whose name is for a few years ranked with the immortals. But the more select poet has his revenge. In him there must be some portion of the quality of poetic thought which is common to all ages, and his small audience will prolong itself, still small but still select, through the coming generations; whereas his popular contemporary owes his popularity to his skill in expressing, so as to catch the general ear, the common truths (or it may be platitudes) of morality, or in putting into easy shape some of the leading features of the thought of his day; and when his method of expression becomes obsolete through the lapse of time he ceases to be of interest and perishes as though he had never been. He may have done good work in his time, but in his own time he has his reward. It is a distinction to be much borne in mind in lending or in recommending books to others. It is not wise to press upon your Philistine or prosaic friend the poems of Rossetti or of Mr. Robert Bridges; but he (and still more she) may very probably derive enjoyment and profit from *The Epic of Hades* or *A Vision of Saints*.

Ten years ago Mr. Morris had with him the voice of the men who write in newspapers as well as the general public. Very smooth things were said of the volumes which he then issued; and his publishers, with somewhat questionable taste, gathered them up and reprinted them at the end of each of his successive works, that he who runs may read, and may find his criticisms ready-made for him. There we read of 'great originality,' 'fine fancy and vivid description,' 'exquisite beauty,' 'loftiness of conception,' 'powerful dramatic situations,' 'the manner of Tennyson at his best,' and so on. Now the times have changed, and though we suspect his works have as wide a circulation as ever, yet it is the fashion to treat

him
news
reacti
praise
overl
L
prese
publis
series
and 1
pearin
worth
sidera
miscel
some
flight
and e
soul in
the st
presen
whom
proble
dignit
grace
which
it was
and w
hardly
TH
thing
to all
various
through
is but
collect
of Gree
which
Marsy
Herach
and th
made a
was so
as the
beauty
these l

him in the newspapers with the superiority of which only a newspaper critic is capable. It is the reaction, and a natural reaction. We think that Mr. Morris was formerly overpraised. We think that now his merits are often unfairly overlooked.

Let us look shortly at the work that he has done, as represented in the volume of his collected verse. His earliest published performances were the poems included in the three series of *Songs of Two Worlds*, which appeared between 1872 and 1875. They were recognized, and a similar volume appearing now from a new poet would be recognized, as a noteworthy collection of verse, and one which suggested considerable promise for the future. They are of a somewhat miscellaneous character, and it is clear that the writer was to some extent trying his wings before venturing on a longer flight; but they are almost all of a meditative description, and exhibit the poet now as the thinker communing with his soul in his study, now as the philosopher wandering through the streets and reflecting on the various sights which are there presented to him. Everywhere there is the tone of one to whom life is constantly bringing up some difficulty or some problem, and the author's thoughts are expressed with a grave dignity and a quietness of touch which, when combined with grace and delicacy of expression, justified the welcome with which the successive parts of this volume were received. But it was *The Epic of Hades* that made Mr. Lewis Morris's name, and which secured for him at the time a popularity which was hardly exceeded by that of the Laureate himself.

The Epic of Hades was, and still is, in our opinion, the best thing that Mr. Morris has done. Its plan is probably familiar to all. Its framework is an imaginary journey through the various worlds of the life which succeeds the life of earth—through Tartarus, Hades, and Olympus—but this framework is but very slightly sketched, and the volume is in essence a collection of some of the most striking stories of the mythology of Greece. They are stories well known and often re-told, but which will always bear the re-telling. Tantalus, Clytemnestra, Marsyas, Andromeda, Helen, Endymion, Persephone, Psyche, Heracles, Athena, Apollo—these are names of which poets and the readers of poetry are never tired. Their stories were made and told by the people which, if ever a people on earth was so, was poetical in every breath of its national spirit; and as the flute of Marsyas retained some portion of the divine beauty of its music even when blown by a mortal voice, so these legends keep the grace and poetry which belongs to

them from their birth, in all the various shapes in which they are again and again presented to a later world. Different poets add some different setting to the old gems, and with Mr. Lewis Morris this setting is found in the reflections which generally accompany each tale, and which draw from it the abstract truth which is latent in the ancient story. And this is in most cases done naturally and gracefully, without arousing the suspicion that the poet wishes to 'improve the occasion.' On the contrary, some of the finest poetry that he has written is contained in these portions of his work. One of the best specimens occurs at the conclusion of the tale of Marsyas, the shepherd whom Apollo conquered in song.

'I do not blame
Phoebus, or Nature which has set this bar
Betwixt success and failure, for I know
How far high failure overleaps the bound
Of low successes. Only suffering draws
The inner heart of song, and can elicit
The perfumes of the soul. 'Twere not enough
To fail, for that were happiness to him
Who ever upward looks with reverent eye,
And seeks but to admire. So, since the race
Of bards soars highest, as who seek to show
Our lives as in a glass, therefore it comes
That suffering weds with song, from him of old
Who solaced his blank darkness with his lyre,
Through all the story of neglect and scorn,
Necessity, sheer hunger, early death,
Which smite the ranks of song.¹ Not only those
Who keep clear accents of the voice divine
Are honourable—they are happy, indeed,
Whate'er the world has held—but those who hear
Some fair faint echoes, though the crowd be deaf,
And see the white gods' garments on the hills,
Which the crowd sees not, though they may not find
Fit music for their thought, they too are blest,
Not pitiable. Not from arrogant pride
Nor over-boldness fail they who have striven
To tell what they have heard, with voice too weak
For such high message. More it is than ease,
Palace and pomp, honours and luxuries,
To have seen white Presences upon the hills,
To have heard the voices of the Eternal Gods.'²

¹ Why has Mr. Morris altered this line in the collected edition of his poems to the much weaker phrase 'which smite the singer still'? The other alterations in this passage are more justifiable.

² *The Works of Lewis Morris*, p. 182.

So, too
passage

On
of Mr.
telling

There
but the
with po
language
express
which a
that M
more s
stories
grace a
also, in
these p
ancient
ancient
The
in plan

¹ Wo
² Aga
'some fa
which se
³ Wo

So, too, the moral of the story of Actæon is told in a fine passage, of which it may be sufficient to quote the first lines :—

‘Life is a chase,
And Man the hunter, always following on,
With hounds of rushing thought or fiery sense,
Some hidden truth or beauty.’¹

One other passage will be enough to illustrate this style of Mr. Lewis Morris's verse. The speaker is Endymion, telling of his slumber on the peak of Latmos :—

‘Yet I judge it better indeed
To seek in life, as now I know I sought,
Some fair impossible Love, which slays our life,
Some high ideal raised too high for man,²
And, failing, to grow mad, and cease to be,
Than to decline, as they do who have found
Broad-paunched content and weal and happiness :
And so an end. For one day, as I know,
The high aim unfulfilled fulfils itself ;
The deep unsatisfied thirst is satisfied ;
And through this twilight, broken suddenly,
The inmost heaven, the lucent stars of God,
The Moon of Love, the Sun of Life ; and I,
I who pine here—I on the Latmian hill
Shall soar aloft and find them.’³

There is no great profundity or originality of thought here, but the idea is in each case a fine one, and it is expressed with perfect clearness and with no slight command of poetical language. The blank verse is smooth and graceful, and the expression never lapses into prose ; and these are gifts of style which are not too common at any time. It is to this quality that Mr. Morris owes most of his popularity, and it was never more successfully displayed than in *The Epic of Hades*. The stories are in themselves poetical, and they are told with grace and ease, and the reflections which they suggest are also, in most cases, expressed with a freshness which makes these poems a pleasant embodiment alike of the myths of ancient Greece and of truths which belong not more to the ancient world than to the modern.

The Epic of Hades was followed by a poem very different in plan—*Gwen*. This is a drama in monologue, in some

¹ *Works*, p. 191.

² Again we prefer the original version to the new one, which has ‘some fair ideal,’ a repetition of the epithet used in the preceding line, which seems to us weak.

³ *Works*, p. 226.

points reminding one of the Laureate's *Maud*, though with the difference that the speaker is changed from time to time. It is a touching story, and though it never rises to any great height of poetry there is a distinct charm about its grace and pathos which makes it an attractive volume, and one which it is easy to believe may well be a prime favourite with many people. *The Ode of Life*, which succeeded it, perhaps achieved a greater success at the time, though we are not sure that there is more real poetry in it. The author had no doubt discovered the fact that his strength and popularity lay in his gift for expressing moral truths and reflections upon human life in graceful and effective verse; and his new poem was therefore wholly built upon this theme. It was a fine idea, but one which would require great force and originality to carry out successfully. Without these qualities there was considerable danger that the writer would relapse into commonplace and monotony. These faults are not altogether avoided by Mr. Lewis Morris. There is a level equability of tone throughout the greater part of the volume, which is apt to weary the reader; and its smooth optimism is perhaps at times rather weak. In spite of this there are several fine passages in the poem, especially in the later parts of it, which deal with Labour, Age, Decline, and Change. A single instance must suffice:—

'There is a sweetness in autumnal days,
Which many a lip doth praise;
When the earth, tired a little and grown mute
Of song, and having borne its fruit,
Rests for a little space ere winter come.
It is not sad to turn the face towards home,
Even though it shows the journey nearly done;
It is not sad to mark the westering sun,
Even though we know the imminent night doth come.
Silence there is, indeed, for song,
Twilight for noon;
But for the steadfast soul and strong
Life's autumn is as June.

To have known the trouble and the fret,
To have known it, and to cease
In a pervading peace,
Too calm to suffer pain, too living to forget,
And reaching down a succouring hand
To where the sufferers are,
To lift them to the tranquil heights afar,
Whereon Time's conquerors stand.'¹

¹ *Works*, p. 310.

TH
that u
anythi
volum
of Br
illustra
to ext
practic
'Niobe
moder
second
cated
namely
best.
and hi
able co
or the
these t
work v
decade
has be
adapte
some o
of the
hardly
them.
gination
the cha
be the
Pos
efforts
any rat
world H
Saints
Hades.
more e
nounce

The Ode of Life was published ten years ago, and since that time we do not think that Mr. Lewis Morris has done anything to advance his reputation. Two out of the three volumes which he has published—*Songs Unsung* and *Songs of Britain*—are miscellaneous collections of verse, which illustrate the writer's gifts and powers rather than do anything to extend them. In the former volume we have what is practically an additional canto of the *Epic* in the poem of 'Niobe,' and somewhat similar studies from Eastern and from modern life in 'Odatis' and 'Clytemnestra in Paris.' The second collection carries further a line which was first indicated in the Breton poems of the earlier volume—that, namely, of ballad poetry. Here Mr. Morris is not seen at his best. His ballads are only too apt to be flat and unpoetical; and his poem on the Armada, in particular, stands in lamentable contrast to the brilliant rhetorical fragment of Macaulay or the swinging stanzas of Swinburne. The minor poems in these two volumes are not of much importance. The third work which has proceeded from Mr. Morris during the last decade is a drama, *Gycia*; and here, again, we think that he has been trying a style of poetry for which his genius is not adapted. There are several fine passages of blank verse, and some of the earlier scenes are well conceived; but the action of the later portion of the play is forced and improbable, and hardly any of the characters have much dramatic life about them. A good drama requires a strong individualising imagination, which can vividly conceive and firmly delineate the characters of the play; and these do not seem to us to be the distinctive qualities of Mr. Morris.

Possibly Mr. Morris himself was conscious that his later efforts had not fulfilled the promise of his earlier poems. At any rate, in the new volume which he has just given to the world he has reverted to his former manner, and *A Vision of Saints* stands avowedly as a companion study to *The Epic of Hades*. Of this new work it may be fitting to give a rather more extended notice. Its purpose and character are announced in some fine lines with which it opens.

'Once, long years since, I dreamt a dream of Greece,
And fair fantastic tales of Nymph and Faun,
And thin heroic forms, and ghostly gods
Floating in loveliness by grove and hill
And lake-side, all the joyous innocent grace
Of the old Pagan fancies; mixt with tales
Of passion and unhappy deeds of old,
Dark, unforgotten.

Yesternight I knew
 Another dream, a vision of old Rome,
 Sterner and harsher, and the new-born grace
 Of sacrifice ; of life which for the Truth
 Bore misery to the death, while they, the blithe
 Faint gods of Fancy, sank to fiends of Ill
 Athirst for pain and blood, and the old grace
 To the new suffering, and the careless lives
 That were content to enjoy, and asked no more
 Than some brief glimpse of Beauty ere they died,
 To grave bent brows, and tortured limbs, and all
 The armoury of pain.¹

For an obvious reason the plan of the *Epic* could not be adhered to in one respect. The martyrs of the Christian faith could not fitly be made to tell themselves the stories of their sufferings and of their constancy. The poet therefore imagines himself led through the world of spirits by a heavenly guide, who recounts to him the stories of the saints whose figures he sees. They are of all ages and of every country. They include the legendary tales of the Seven Sleepers and of St. Christopher, and the truer narratives of saints such as Perpetua and Felicitas, Cecilia, Dorothea, St. Francis of Assisi and St. Elizabeth of Hungary, George Herbert and John Bunyan, Henry Martyn, Elizabeth Fry, and, finally, the saint whom but yesterday the consent of every civilized country and every creed canonized, Joseph Damien. No doubt there are many others, whose names will occur differently to different readers, who might have been included in this band ; but the roll of Christian martyrs is too long to be comprehended in one volume of verse, and all of these are saints worthy of any poet. Only one name mars, to some extent, the symmetry of the volume, that of Antoninus Pius. No doubt he is one of those that 'are of Him who call not on His name ;' but if such were to be included there are many others who have an equal claim on the poet, and with so large a field to choose from in Christian history it seems a mistake to open the door to one solitary representative of a much wider circle.

Viewed simply from the standpoint of poetry, it may be doubted whether the plan of the *Vision of Saints* is equal to that of its earlier rival. There is pathos enough, indeed, and beauty enough in the stories of the men and women who have faced death or, often a harder task, have endured life for the sake and in the name of Christ ; but it is a sombre

¹ *A Vision of Saints*, p. 1.

beaut
 varie
 one r
 partic
 Chris
 Lives
 died
 the in
 what
 story
 Furth
 to na
 them
 tive f
 vals a
 he ge
 seem
 A
 a fin
 the l
 verse
 suited
 hardl
 equal
 invol
 which
 One c
 which
 the n
 were

beauty, not so available for poetry as the lighter and more varied beauty of the legends of Greece. The story of one martyrdom is, in its essence, very like that of another, particularly in the far distant centuries when the test of Christianity was to endure to the death, suffering manfully. Lives lived for Christ may vary almost infinitely; deaths died for Him cannot differ greatly in their pattern. And so the impression left by the stories of the earlier saints is somewhat confused and indistinct, except in the case of such a story as that of St. Christopher, or the gardener-saint Phocas. Further, in this volume each poem is nearly entirely confined to narrative, and we miss the meditative variations on the theme suggested by each which is, perhaps, the most attractive feature of the *Epic*. In place of these we have at intervals a short ejaculatory utterance by the poet, or rather, as he generally particularises it, by his soul, which generally seems to us somewhat to miss the mark.

At the same time there can be little question that this is a finer volume than any that Mr. Morris has published for the last ten years at least. The gracefulness of his blank verse is not less than it was, and it is a grace which is well suited to narrative. Indeed, for simple narration we know hardly any writer of the present day who is master of a style equally meritorious. It is always clear, always natural, never involved, and never lapsing into prose; and these are qualities which not many contemporary poets possess in an equal degree. One of the most poetical passages in the whole volume is that which describes how Phocas, the flower-loving saint, received the news that the guests whom he had sheltered in his house were in search of him, with orders for his execution.

‘But he, when all the house was dark and still,
Stole out into his garden. The faint stars,
Pale in the radiance of the summer night,
Trembled above him; at his feet the flowers
He loved so well declined their heavy heads
And slumbering petals. One loud nightingale,
Thrilling the tender passionate note of old,
Throbbled from a flower-cupped tree, and round him all
The thousand perfumes of the summer night
Steeped every sense in fragrance sweeter far
Than frankincense the skill of men compounds
In Araby the Blest. Then on the grass
He sate him down, rapt deep in musing thought;
And o’er him, ghostly white or gleaming red,
The roses glimmered, and the lilies closed
Their pure white cups, and bowed their heads, and seemed
To overhear his thought.’

He meditates whether to fly, to save his life a little while, and to preach the Faith a little longer. Then he rises, 'and softly, half in dreams, began to delve The flower-lit turf,' and so labours through the night,

'Till with earliest dawn,
Just as the waking birds began their song,
He flung the last mould upwards, smoothing fair
The edges of the trench, and knew at length
That all night long he laboured at his grave.
And at its foot were lilies white and gold,
And at its head were roses white and red,
And all around a pitying quire of flowers
Bent down, regarding it; and when he saw,
Still half as in a dream, he whispered, "Lo!
The narrow bed is ready; ere 'tis day
The sleeper shall be laid in it, and prove
Unbroken slumbers blest, until the peal
Of the loud Angel wakes him from the skies."'¹

We have not space to quote more at length; but those who have admired any of Mr. Morris's earlier volumes may be satisfied that *A Vision of Saints* will not lower his reputation, even if it does not appreciably raise it. Its fault appears to be chiefly a tendency to monotony, a too equable flow of clear and easy narrative, and a general similarity between many of the stories. In addition to this there is an occasional technical lapse which we have not observed before in Mr. Morris's verse—namely, the admission of rhyming lines in juxtaposition, and this not only at the end of a poem, where it is excusable, as at the end of an act in an Elizabethan play, but also elsewhere, where it has no justification. The level character of the verse throughout the volume makes it difficult to select any part as particularly worthy of commendation; but not the least interesting are the two lives with which the *Vision* closes, those of Elizabeth Fry, the indefatigable toiler in the prisons and on convict ships, and Father Damien, the pathos of whose life is well indicated by the touching detail which Mr. Morris has borrowed from the narratives published since his death:—

'When he preached,
And when he toiled among the sick, or gave
His Church's solemn office, all his words
Were of "us lepers," glorying in the load
The will of Heaven assigned to him, and proud,
Even as his dear Lord touched with healing hand
The lepers of old time and made them whole,
To be as those he loved in life and death.'²

¹ *A Vision of Saints*, pp. 89-92.

² *Ibid.* p. 285.

Th
a poet
is sure
rary t
advanc
possibl
which
will be
class h
Tennys
we do
But the
there is
these.
To one
elabora
languag
pathos.
His spe
blank v
truths v
found.
be unde
happy l
through
two thi
the high
sion of
excess o
is super
him by
Morris.
tive reve
old fami
new set
which ha
at a diff
same tru
requires
interpret
He may
not stand
or in tha
great po
generati
VOL. X

There is no reason to suppose that Mr. Morris's career as a poet is closed with this volume, and any future work of his is sure to be welcomed with interest; but it would be contrary to all experience if he were to make any very marked advance on what he has already written, and it is therefore possible to form some sort of a judgment on the position which he has won for himself in contemporary literature. It will be clear from what has been said already that we do not class him in the first rank of Victorian poets. He is not with Tennyson or Browning, Swinburne or Matthew Arnold; and we do not say that we should place him next after these. But the roll of singers of this generation is a long one, and there is an honourable place for many who do not stand with these. Classification is hard, because the gifts are so various. To one man is given the power of exquisite finish and careful elaboration, to another a gorgeous flow of highly-coloured language, to another humour, to another thought, to another pathos. In none of these qualities is Mr. Morris supreme. His special gift seems to us to lie in his mastery of a musical blank verse, which confers distinction on his expression of truths which, though often beautiful and fine, are seldom profound. And this gift of expression is not one which should be undervalued. According to Emerson, we should all, in our happy hours, be inexhaustible poets if once we could break through the silence into adequate rhyme. The poet requires two things—imagination and expression. In the greatest, the highest imagination is matched with the noblest expression of it; in lesser men, the imagination sometimes is in excess of the power of expression, but oftener the expression is superior to the gift of imagination. It is so, if we judge him by an absolute standard of excellence, with Mr. Lewis Morris. He has no special message to tell to men, no distinctive revelation, whether of truth or beauty; but he takes the old familiar truths and he sets them before us once again in a new setting of happy words and phrases. This is a task which has to be done afresh for each generation, as each looks at a different portion of the eternal truths, or looks at the same truths from a different point of view. Each generation requires its interpreter, and the poet who is recognized as the interpreter of his generation is the popular poet of his time. He may not be the greatest poet of his age. His name may not stand the highest in the estimation of subsequent centuries, or in that of the best judges in his own day. But he holds a great position and may do much for good or for evil in his generation. In the fullest sense that position is occupied for

the generation which is now closing, by Lord Tennyson, but next to him there is no one who has been so widely accepted by the ordinary run of general readers as Mr. Lewis Morris.

The weakness of Mr. Morris, on the other hand, appears to lie in a defect of the poetic imagination. Bacon draws a distinction between the 'sublime and discursive' minds which detect analogies, and the 'persevering and acute' minds which discern differences. The distinction is true in philosophy, as between two such minds as Plato's and Aristotle's; but it is still more true as the distinction between the poetic and the prosaic mind. The true poet sees analogies and similitudes everywhere, and illustrates his thought by materials drawn from sources of the most diverse kind. It is from this gift that Milton gets his similes and his epithets, and Browning his overwhelming mass of comparisons and metaphors, and Rossetti his highly-coloured and imaginative language. They bring together ideas from most dissimilar sources, and their poetry gains thereby in beauty, in force, and in distinction. It is here that we seem to find Mr. Morris wanting. The sense of monotone which pervades most of his writing (and his later work, such as the *Vision of Saints*, more than the *Epic of Hades*) is largely due to the limitation of his sources of illustration, and the consequent repetition of similar words or terms of expression. The reader would gain if he could completely forget all Mr. Morris's previous writings whenever he takes in hand a new poem by him. The tone is too equal, the colour too unvarying, the emotions too similar; and the reader begins to think before long that he has discovered the trick of Mr. Morris's composition and has seen to the bottom the extent of his poetical resources.

But, if it is impossible to find in Mr. Lewis Morris the poet of first-class rank for whom the lovers of English literature are looking to replace the leaders of the generation which is passing away, it is quite possible to be thankful that we have minor poets such as he is. With the greater extent of more than respectable verse which is written nowadays goes a greater power of appreciating good poetry in the world at large. The number of persons who are really good judges of poetry must, no doubt, always be small; but this too is far larger now than at any earlier period in English literature. It is not in mortals to command a greater supply of poetic genius of the first rank; it still remains true that the poet must be born, though after he is born, he still has to make himself a poet by much labour. But a greater supply of poetic *talent* can be and is produced by a greater extent of

the tas
writer
given
whose
to the
fine w
seem t
Mr. M

A
The Bis
Rig
Fre
188

THIS r
themes,
The 'Bi
George
the Bish
Theologi
States.

getic pur
shall be

'the defe
varying er
fessedly re
of such ce
and the H
the Church

The Engl

¹ We re
publisher,
country. P
may be rem

the taste for and appreciation of good poetry. And many a writer whose name is not written among the immortals has given pleasure and enlightenment and help to many a reader whose name he never knows, and has so done his good work to the extent of the talents with which he is gifted. In the fine words which we have already quoted once, but which seem to sum up better than mere prose can do the moral of Mr. Morris's poetical achievements—

‘Not only those
Who keep clear accents of the voice divine
Are honourable—they are happy, indeed,
Whate’er the world has held—but those who hear
Some fair faint echoes, though the crowd be deaf,
And see the white gods’ garments on the hills.’

ART. VII.—BISHOP KINGDON ON THE INCARNATION.

The Bishop Paddock Lectures, 1890. God Incarnate. By the Right Rev. H. T. KINGDON, D.D., Bishop-Coadjutor of Fredericton, New Brunswick, Canada. (New York 1890.)

THIS remarkable volume, on the highest of all possible themes, will be gratefully welcomed by the Church at large.¹ The ‘Bishop Paddock Lectureship’ was founded in 1880, by George A. Jarvis, a warm personal friend of Dr. Paddock, the Bishop of Massachusetts, by a gift in trust to the General Theological Seminary of the Anglican Church in the United States. Like the Oxford Bampton Lectures it has an apologetic purpose. The Deed of Trust declares that the Lectures shall be devoted to

‘the defence of the religion of Jesus Christ . . . against the varying errors of the day, whether materialistic, rationalistic, or professedly religious, and also to its defence and confirmation in respect of such central truths as the *Trinity*, the *Atonement*, *Justification*, and the *Inspiration of the Word of God*, and of such central facts as the *Church's Divine Order and Sacraments*, &c.’

The English Bishop Coadjutor of Fredericton, Dr. Kingdon,

¹ We regret that its title-page does not bear the name of an English publisher, and that the work is not more readily procurable in this country. Perhaps this, as well as its one defect, the want of an Index, may be remedied in the second edition.

well-known in London as an able colleague of Benjamin Webb's on the clerical staff of St. Andrew's, Wells Street, was selected, by the Board of Appointment created by the Trust, to deliver in New York the Paddock Lectures of 1890. He rightly perceived that of the varying errors of the day a large proportion arises from inadequate or erroneous views of the Incarnation, and, thinking especially, as it was natural a Bishop should, of the needs of a class whose more adequate training for their holy function is just now engaging the earnest attention of the Church at home, he insists, in his brief Preface, that 'it is of the utmost importance that the attention of candidates for Holy Orders should be concentrated upon the fundamental doctrine of the Incarnation. At no time has this been of greater importance than at the present moment.' This special object has been worthily kept in view throughout the volume, which will accordingly be of the greatest possible value to theological students.

It is unquestionably a true instinct which is guiding the Church of our generation to give special prominence to the clear and definite enunciation of the Christian belief as to this supreme central verity. In evidence of the strength and extent of this instinct, we are able to point—not to go beyond our own branch of the Church—to Archdeacon Wilberforce's work on the Incarnation; to a volume, far too little known, we fear, *The Messiah* (Murray, 1861), the work, it is said, of a pious layman, who preferred to withhold his name; to Prebendary Sadler's *Emmanuel*, less scholastic in treatment, but most practically helpful, and perhaps likely to be more attractive to the ordinary reader; to the precious treasure of Dr. Liddon's Bampton Lectures of 1866 *On the Divinity of Our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ*; to the Rev. P. G. Medd's Bampton Lectures of 1882, *The One Mediator*, which bear very directly on the subject; and to Canon Mason's recent volume, *The Faith of the Gospel*. Further, it is an open secret that the Church is looking forward with interest, not unmingled with anxiety, to a treatment of the same majestic theme by the Bampton Lecturer of this year, the editor of *Lux Mundi*.

Very probably, Bishop Kingdon's transatlantic experience has made him feel, even more acutely than we on this side, the need of a careful corrective to prevalent errors. Here we are as yet hardly familiar with the wild extravagance of unbridled and irreverent, and even ridiculous, speculation which can argue—as transatlantic correspondents assure us—in the following kind of way: 'We learn from Scripture and Nature

that
take
roses
duce
monk
in Se
produ
This
select
so tha
This
time
of be
these,
carefu
in hig
Amid
consta
a mis
Kingd
maner
In
himself
laid un
author
say), b
the lat
recent
writing
Canon
Morals
promis
Moore,
may in
doubt a
yet by
our own
and de
And
work, w
especial

¹ De
this Revi
were hel
tributor t

that God works as gardeners and agriculturists work. They take common grass and foster it into wheat. They take wild roses and wild fruit-trees, and by budding and grafting produce good results. The same is seen in mankind. The monkey has been taken, and by successive graftings, as seen in Seth, Noah, Abraham, &c., an excellent stock has been produced, which naturally and necessarily produced Christ. This is a sample of what can be done. Hence, by carefully selecting subjects of marriage more Christs may be produced, so that eventually mankind may become a world of Christs.¹ This looks like Evolution gone mad. It was indeed high time that the intelligent faith of Christians, in any danger of being influenced by wild and absurd imaginations like these, should be stayed and steadied and reinforced by some careful and authoritative declaration of the truth from those in high and responsible positions in the Church of Christ. Amid his manifold labours, amid the interruptions of his constant and wearisome journeyings over what is practically a missionary diocese as large in area as Scotland, Bishop Kingdon has done this; and has thereby established a permanent claim on the gratitude of the whole Church.

In rendering this great and necessary service, he shows himself fully master of the literature of the subject, and has laid under contribution the most recent as well as the older authors. He refers to, and quotes from (we need hardly say), both the late and the present Bishop of Durham, and the late Dean of St. Paul's, whose name reminds us of another recent and irreparable loss.¹ He is also indebted to the writings of Canon W. Cooke; and to the kindred works of Canon McColl (*Christianity in Relation to Science and Morals*), and of one, the early close of whose career, so full so promise, the Church is still lamenting, the Rev. Aubrey L. Moore, in his volume entitled *Science and the Faith*. We may indeed be thankful to be able to point, in these days of doubt and questioning and controversy, to so goodly a list, yet by no means an exhaustive one, of recent works within our own Communion, which are devoted to the elucidation and defence of the great central verities of the Faith.

And now, looking more particularly at Dr. Kingdon's work, which we earnestly trust our readers, and such of them especially as are students of theology and candidates for

¹ Dean Church was very closely connected with the first founding of this Review, and some of the earliest meetings of its original promoters were held under his auspices. He was also, from time to time, a contributor to its pages.

Holy Orders, will procure for themselves, we note with satisfaction his dictum (pp. 5, 7) that, on questions of faith and religion, 'there is no theory which satisfies all demands of human reason as does the Christian teaching. . . . The difficulties which unbelief produces are by far the greater, and there is no door of reverent thought which true Christianity cannot unlock, while unbelief often helps to double-lock them and bar them up effectually.' The truth of these assertions is then exemplified in relation to the fundamental conceptions of the Existence, the Unity, the Perfection, and the plural Personality of the Supreme Being. With regard to this last point we may do well to quote the following weighty passage:

'In a Perfect Being social capacities imply the means of gratifying them. The crowning revelation, therefore, is that "God is love." Now we cannot conceive of love without an object. Love would not then be love, it would only be the capacity for love. Love would not be love without exercise. We, therefore, could not conceive that God is love if He were a solitary Unit, to speak with deepest reverence. . . . Hence, we may say once more that reason is Christian in demanding that God be eternally a Father, eternally produced toward Himself, with a Son Who is "the Brightness of His glory, and the express Image of His Person"' (p. 12).

And this the Bishop follows up with the true and pregnant remark of Aubrey Moore (*Lux Mundi*, p. 92):

'The Fathers do not treat the doctrine of the Trinity in Unity merely as a revealed mystery, still less as something which complicates the simple teaching of Monotheism, but as the condition of rationally holding the Unity of God.'

From the thought of the Nature of God we are led to the thought of that mystery of Creation of which the Son, the Eternal Word, is the 'Mediatorial Agent;' and we find some thoughtful remarks on that earlier stage of Creation, viz. of the holy angels, and on the direct creation of each angel individually, from which it results that there is no common and identical 'nature of angels,' and that consequently, for this reason among others, the Eternal Son, in uniting Himself with the Creature, 'of the angels took not hold' (Heb. ii. 16).

The subject of Creation naturally suggests that of Evolution. As to this, the following weighty words dispose at once of any uneasiness that might be felt, if Darwinism—which is still on its trial, and which, after all, is only a question of methods and processes, not of origins—were to be finally accepted by the scientific world:

'If
main, i
once, I
lution f
in to h
tell us
animal
or spec
it canno
mist w
sciousne
alone o
to be f
science
discove

And a

'Bo
cess, o
the Cre
the wor
as seen
believe

Th
tial pe
that fr
which
and w
on the
theolo
adopti
suade
was pa
Christ
history
by the
been r
'in tha
ness o
'Perso
might
In
Nicen
intend

1 Of
essay o
of Durh

'If this theory of Evolution be generally taken to be true in the main, is it contrary to the Truth of Revelation? To this I answer at once, It cannot be ; and then, secondly, It is not. For where Evolution fails to account for certain phenomena, there Revelation steps in to help out the record. Evolution does not profess or pretend to tell us about the prime origin of things. If all known forms of animal and vegetable life could be traced back to a protoplasmic germ or speck, or to primeval "fire mist," Evolution can go no further ; it cannot tell where the protoplasm came from, or whence the fire mist was developed. Evolution cannot account for the self-consciousness of man, or for that which cannot be denied, that man alone of animals is found to be deliberately choosing what he knows to be for his hurt. In all this, Revelation steps in and tells us what science, with its dissecting knife, or microscope, or balance, cannot discover' (p. 32).

And again :

'Both records (Scripture and Science) would teach orderly process, orderly progress ; Scripture teaches the ever-present care of the Creator. As far as this is concerned, it is not important whether the work be instantaneous or gradual. The survey of God's work, as seen in the world around us now, and in history, would lead us to believe that all God's work is gradual and, if you will, slow' (p. 34).

The creation of man in a condition of 'conditional potential perfection,' his being placed in a state of probation, with that freedom of the will and consequent possibility of sinning which are inseparable from it, are touched in clear language and with no uncertain hand. And reaching the third Lecture, on the Incarnation, the thoughtful and philosophic student of theology will note the respectful mention, without express adoption, of the growing belief that 'there is much to persuade us that the Personal Union of God with His creature was part of the "eternal purpose which God appointed in Christ Jesus our Lord"' (p. 50); that 'the central fact of history, the focus of all God's work,' was not merely motivated by the need of man's redemption from sin, but would have been realized in any case ; and that Adam was made at the first 'in that Image which the Creator would assume "in the fullness of time ;"' with the purpose and result that, through His 'Personal conjunction with the common nature of man, He might be at once in touch with all His creation' (p. 48).

In this connexion the writer notes in the wording of the Nicene Creed a distinction, which we cannot quite think was intended by its framers, between the purposes or motives of

¹ Of course, on this question our author refers 'inquirers' to the great essay on 'The Gospel of Creation' by Professor Westcott (now Bishop of Durham), at the end of his *Commentary on the Epistles of St. John*.

the Incarnation. He remarks: 'The language is—"Who for us men, and for our salvation, was made Man." "For us men" first was He incarnate—a wider benefit than the narrower one "for our salvation"' (p. 52). We confess we should rather have thought that here the 'and' is epexegetic, meaning 'that is, for our salvation.' Again, we read at the commencement of the Lecture on the Atonement:

'We believe that the Exemplar of humanity is and always was present to the mind of God as humanity as it is in Christ Jesus. Man was formed in the image and likeness of God, and also after the Ideal existing in the Design of the Creator; so that the Creator might become Incarnate in the form predetermined from all eternity' (p. 93).

And in the same Lecture, in words evidently expressing the author's own belief:

'It has been said [*i.e.* in Lecture III. On the Incarnation] that careful examination of Revelation warrants the belief that the Creator designed a Personal Union between Himself and His creation from the first, and that man was the creature formed with sympathies with the rest of creation with this special view, that in the "fulness of time" God would become Incarnate in man's nature. The merciful purpose held on its course notwithstanding the outrage of man's sin and defection; but now, in addition to the mercy and love of taking the creature into Union, there was superadded the greater exhibition of mercy and love in the redemption and restoration of man' (p. 109).

We are persuaded that the deeper believing thought of our time tends towards the conviction of the truth of the Scotist idea, that the Incarnation was the eternal thought and purpose of the Creator, independently of the possibility or the fact of sin, and of the consequent necessity, in the love and mercy of God, for Redemption by Suffering. Besides the hints of Holy Scripture dwelt upon by our author, there are deep-lying reasons why it should be so, connected with the fact and purpose of Creation, and with the difficult questions which it necessarily raises, and which can only thus be solved. St. Paul's language to the Ephesians indicates—what we should suppose all who think at all on this stupendous theme must accept—that the results of the union of the Creator with the Creature in the Incarnation extend far beyond the world of man, and affect the whole of creation. And those results must be of the most inconceivably far-reaching kind. It seems impossible to hold that their achievement should have been contingent on the access of evil to the world of man. For creation, even in its highest forms, and even had it continued throughout untainted by evil, is yet, in itself and apart from

God, n
with H
manem
tion be
creation
remain
Love,
and th
This p
the ide
full sel
Ha
Life up
nated
makes
the Bis
nature
Pointin
primev
gelium
'Theop
in the
and Ty
before
to Bish
bearing
veil of
further
ance of
the un
v. and
their in
of the
should

¹ Co
edit.), a
chap. vi
also Me
Gospel,
eternity
ditional
man sho
creation
contain
depend
ever, Dr
Incarnat

God, necessarily finite and imperfect. Only through its union with Him, and that a union to endure for ever, could its permanence be assured, and its endless progress towards perfection be realized. Without that union, and regarded in itself, creation must, even in its highest conceivable development, remain inadequate, as the expression of either God's Power or Love, or as the manifestation of His Character. God is Love; and the great impulse of love is unselfish self-communication. This points to an Incarnation as necessarily bound up with the idea of Creation, for the Incarnation is the only means of full self-communication by the Creator to the creature.¹

Having dwelt upon the slow general upward progress of Life upon our globe, until, in the creation of Man, it culminated in the 'intervention of the Creator with a new gift which makes Man the head and king of the organic kingdom' (p. 47), the Bishop describes the position of the Protoplast, in whose nature the Creator would unite the creature to Himself. Pointing out the repeated and varied reminders of the great primeval promise and prophecy enwrapped in the '*Protevangelium* of Redemption,' he draws especial attention to the 'Theophanies,' those mysterious appearances at certain epochs in the record of the Chosen Race which form, with Prophecy and Type, the 'third group of witness which God gave to man before the Incarnation was complete' (p. 57). We are thankful to Bishop Kingdon for having done so; for the true nature and bearing of these critical incidents is partially disguised by the veil of a translation (and this perhaps inevitably), and still further obscured, at least in one cardinal instance—the appearance of the 'Captain of the host of the Lord' to Joshua—by the unfortunate break in the narrative between Joshua, chap. v. and chap. vi. The consequence has been, we fear, that their importance and significance as 'proleptic manifestations of the Incarnate Lord' have not been usually realized as they should have been by the ordinary English reader. But these

¹ Compare H. N. Oxenham, *On the Atonement*, chap. i. (p. 79, 2nd edit.), and the references to Robertson and Maurice; and Note 2 to chap. vi. on *Recent Lutheran Theology on the Motive of the Incarnation*; also Medd's *Bampton Lectures*, §§ 58-63; and Mason's *Faith of the Gospel*, chap. vi. § 5. 'We may believe that while the Atonement was from eternity the conditional purpose of God, the Incarnation was His unconditional purpose—that He willed His Son to suffer and to die for men if man should fall, but to become man in any case. The drawing of the creation into union with the Creator, "in the Christ, Jesus our Lord," was contained in the very idea of Creation; the circumstances and conditions depended upon the way in which men might choose to act.' See, however, Dr. Bright's wise words of caution in a Note to *St. Leo on the Incarnation*, p. 217.

Prælia Incarnationis, as Bishop Bull calls them, have their place in the great argument for Christianity. They are a striking evidence of the pre-incarnate operation of Him through Whom, though as yet unseen and unrevealed, a mighty *Præparatio Evangelica* was ever being secretly administered. Some who had the pleasure of conversing with the Bishop of Calcutta when he was in this country some two years ago, on the occasion of the Lambeth Conference, may remember how, speaking of the difficulty of impressing the Hindoo mind with the beauty and fitness of the Christian scheme and the position of its Divine Head, he remarked 'that it seemed to suit their needs to lay stress on the work of our Lord before the Incarnation, in the way of governing and administering the created Universe.' The Theophanies are particular instances of this more general and highly important truth. Not seldom, in so vast and complex a subject as Revealed Religion, what is lightly regarded, or even altogether overlooked, by some, may be to others, differently circumstanced, of different mental tendencies and habits, or of other life-experience, exactly what is needed to help them to grasp the truth. And superficial thinkers and believers are unfortunately not seldom too ready, especially under the subtle influences of a sham liberalism and so-called 'breadth of thought,' to compromise, or even to throw away, as a sop to those who will never be appeased, portions of revealed Truth, or formulas necessary for its definite expression.

The great theme of the work before us is continued in the Fourth Lecture, on 'The Perfection of Sympathy,' as exhibited in the Life and Character of our Incarnate Lord, and in the Fifth, on 'The Atonement.' In the former the truth of the reality and perfection of the humanity assumed by the Incarnate Lord is first exhibited in careful and balanced statement, as the foundation of the perfection of His sympathy and the standing assurance of it to us who so sorely need it. The various errors—ancient but by no means extinct—associated with the names of Eutyches, Nestorius, and Apollinaris, whereby—however unintentionally, and in some cases motivated by mistaken reverence or by reaction from dangerous error of a contrary sort—the saving truth of a real Incarnation was obscured or deflected, or even virtually denied, are clearly pointed out with firm and discriminating hand. The glorious truth stands out in clear definition that

'He is perfect man: "He knoweth whereof we are made," by personal experience. He has perfect sympathy with mankind in everything: not in individual eccentricities, but in that which is common

to all.
places
could n
continu
the anc

We
plete t
objecti
of Chr
natural
thorou
an Eas
bears v
finding
of evid
biograp
which
stantia
insists,
for a g
it did,
His fas
that th
ness, an
men an
and th
to outw

On
tion ap
culties-
charact
gelist's
which J
the evi
suggest
though
who ne
a cavil
discern
given u

And
which
in the
notorio
ignorant

to all. . . . The Lord was in perfect sympathy with all men, of all places, of all times. An Eastern will find points of sympathy which could not be observed by a Western ; a modern man will rejoice over continually discovered points of sympathy which were passed over by the ancients' (p. 79).

We are thus led to a discussion (pp. 80-87), more complete than we remember to have seen anywhere before, of the objection that perfection cannot be ascribed to the Humanity of Christ 'from the absence of mirth and of laughter as its natural and genial manifestation.' This would seem to be a thoroughly *modern* objection, and one that would never occur to an Eastern mind. Moreover, it is surely of a sort which of itself bears witness to the extreme difficulty (to say the least) of finding any defects in the human character of Christ. Absence of evidence proves nothing. It would not occur to Oriental biographers, especially to such as stood in the relation in which the Evangelists stood to their Master, to dwell circumstantially on the lighter side of human life. But, as our author insists, the presence at the marriage at Cana in Galilee stands for a great deal in the desired direction, especially coming, as it did, so soon after His forty days' solitude in the wilderness, His fasting, and Temptation. Further, it must be remembered that the subsequent ministry was 'a period of unbroken weariness, and of such mental strain, in daily contact with sinful men around Him, as we can have no distant conception of; and this alone would have been physiologically antagonistic to outward expression of mirth' (p. 86).

On this point we would only add—and the same consideration applies to some other alleged but really imaginary difficulties—that account must be taken of the very fragmentary character of the Evangelical memoirs, and of the latest Evangelist's repeated reminder, that 'there are many other things which Jesus did' which have remained unrecorded—a reminder the evident special emphasis of which would almost seem to suggest that even St. John had encountered people who thought they could trace defects in the great Portraiture, and who needed one knows not what further evidence, to satisfy a cavilling spirit, or to prop a feeble faith which could not discern the Divine grandeur of the picture which the Four have given us.

Another point, and one of greater delicacy and difficulty, which has recently been very distinctly raised by a passage in the present Bampton Lecturer's contribution to a recent notorious volume, is that of 'the Lord's gradual growth out of ignorance, and indeed the fact of His ignorance altogether.'

We in England have just now special reasons for some regret that this subject has not been treated of at greater length by so capable a hand as the writer of the volume before us. Of course he insists on the 'perfection'—which carries with it the reality—of Christ's Manhood, and points out how a true Humanity necessarily connotes certain limitations, and so not merely admits, but implies, such growth, intellectual, moral, and spiritual, as Holy Scripture has been understood to assert of the Man, Christ Jesus. St. Luke (ii. 52) tells us that 'Jesus increased in wisdom and stature'; St. John, that He was 'full of . . . truth.' Dr. Liddon's remarks on these expressions deserve attention:

'There are, then, two representations before us, one suggesting a limitation of knowledge, the other a fulness of knowledge in the Human Soul of Christ. . . . If by an infused knowledge He was, even as a Child, "full of truth," yet that He might enter with the sympathy of experience into the various conditions of our intellectual life, He would seem to have acquired, by the slow labour of observation and of inference, a new mastery over truths which He already, in another sense, possessed. . . . We can conceive that the reality of our Lord's intellectual development would not necessarily be inconsistent with the simultaneous perfection of His knowledge. As Man he might have received an infused knowledge of all truth, and yet have taken possession through experience and in detail of that which was latent in His mind in order to correspond with the intellectual conditions of ordinary human life.'¹

This admirable statement of the problem involved, it would not be easy to amend or to gainsay.

On the possible objection that the immunity of our Lord's most sacred and sinless Body from sickness and disease might seem to detract *pro tanto* from the perfection of His Sympathy, Bishop Kingdon observes most truly:

'The New Head of the human race, the last Adam, sustained all the collective burden of human sickness in undergoing the common end of all sickness, even death; and in the extremity of woe of that death He summed up all the pains of all varieties of sickness and disease. In His case, too, the suffering was the greater, since the more refined the nature the more sensitive it is to pain. The Lord therefore suffered, as none other man suffered or can suffer. Thus He had perfect sympathy with us in our sicknesses' (p. 89).

The chapter on the Atonement ably sets forth the transcendent import of the Death of the Incarnate, and traces it to its source in the love of God, Father and Son, to Man, pointing out the evidence of its need in the sense of guilt exhibited even among Gentile nations, and the witness to

¹ *Bampton Lectures*, 13th edit., p. 465.

the un-
ably un-
once th
'the w
ance of
author
of the
the nar
all Fri
and the
eating
after o
deacon
'the su
vented
annual

The
redemp
work o
fully d
been sa
as bein
Doubtl
Death,
Father
volunta
not sep
sacrific
seal. I
Me, but
and I
death,
great v
princip
in doin
Him, a
of Hun
the righ
words w
beloved

The
and 'Th
what w
whethe
and mu

the universal craving for atonement afforded by the remarkably universal prevalence of the institution of sacrifice, as at once the confession that death, and alienation from God, are 'the wages of sin,' and the 'token of the renewal or continuance of the covenant or union with God' (pp. 106, 111). Our author emphasizes the significance of the fact of the cessation of the Levitical sacrifices by his adoption of the belief 'that the name Preparation (still used for Good Friday, and so for all Fridays in the year) is a continual testimony that St. John and the early Christian writers are correct in stating that the eating of the Paschal Lamb by the Jews was on the evening *after* our Lord's death,' but that—and herein he follows Archdeacon Freeman, *Principles of Divine Service*, pt. ii. 299—'the supernatural darkness from noon to three o'clock prevented the offering of the daily evening lamb, as well as the annual Paschal Lamb' (p. 113).

The significance of the terms propitiation or sin-offering, redemption, and 'reconciliation' or 'atonement,' by which the work of Christ is represented in the New Testament, is carefully drawn out. But we should have been glad if more had been said as to His 'life of perfect obedience even unto death,' as being the 'satisfaction for the sins of the whole world.' Doubtless there is a deep and special mystery in Christ's Death, and in the sense of desolation, of the hiding of the Father's Face, which accompanied it as the crowning agony voluntarily accepted for us by the Sin-bearer. But we must not separate the Death of Self-sacrifice from the Life of Self-sacrifice of which it was the crowning act, the climax, and the seal. In His case Who said 'No man taketh My life from Me, but I lay it down of Myself; I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again,' the submission to death, the penalty of sin, with all that that involved, was a great voluntary act, the last act of a life whose unvarying principle throughout had been absolute and entire submission, in doing or in suffering, to the Father's Will Who had sent Him, and which therefore had so perfectly realized the ideal of Human Nature, in an entire and satisfying conformity to the righteous law of God, that of Him, and of Him alone, the words were true in the highest conceivable sense, 'This is My beloved Son, in Whom I am well pleased.'

The two remaining Lectures are upon 'The Sacraments' and 'The Gift of the Holy Ghost.' Perhaps this order reverses what would have seemed to most the more natural sequence, whether as regards the historic order of time, or the order of idea and mutual connection. But both Lectures are very especially

valuable. In that on the Sacraments the needs of the present time are, as we should have expected in the case of one of Bishop Kingdon's extended pastoral experience, acutely present to the mind of the writer. In many quarters, in the interest, as it is most mistakenly supposed, of 'spiritual religion,' the essentially sacramental character of New Testament Christianity is grievously overlooked and disparaged. The inevitable result of this is seen in a stunted spiritual life and an easy acquiescence in a low religious standard, as well as in a feeble apprehension of the supernatural and unseen, which is really, in its latent essence, rationalistic and Sadducean.

The only foundation for any true and adequate grasp of the meaning and necessity of Sacraments, and of that sacramental character which is not confined to the two commonly so called, is to be found, we need hardly say, in a worthy and thoughtful faith as to the great Sacrament of all Sacraments, the Incarnation itself. Any at all adequate conception of this fundamental fact at once rescues us from the risk of regarding the Christian Sacraments as mere outward forms of an arbitrary character, and so dispensable and indeed indifferent. And such risk is in these days by no means uncommon, especially among those whose religious life has been influenced by the ideas and practices of communities which, being outside the Church and having no Priesthood, tend naturally to depreciate Sacraments and to insist exclusively on Faith. For us the Incarnation is the reunion of Man to God, the sole source of life, and of Man in his whole complex constitution of body, soul, and spirit. By the natural derivation of the flesh and blood of the First Man, the Old Adam, sin and death came upon all men. There must be, for salvation, an equally real relation of man—body, soul, and spirit—to the New Adam, the 'Second Man,' the 'Lord from Heaven.' 'As the Father hath life in Himself, so hath He given to the Son to have life in Himself.' 'He hath given unto us eternal life, and this life is in His Son.' That life must come to us from Him, Who is thus become in His Incarnate Nature a 'life-giving spirit,' not merely by believing acceptance of truths and facts taught us about Him—though that of course, and necessarily, and at the first—nor, again, merely by religious knowledge and moral enlightenment communicated to mind and intellect—though this also necessarily—but by real contact of nature, real communication of His God-penetrated humanity to our sin-stricken and enfeebled humanity—real, and, of course, mysterious; yet not in fact more mysterious, in the sense of being

untrace
transm
declara
drink
nor fig
expres
analog
experie
pation,
An

Incarn
cleansi
depths
necessi
Sacram
munica
may, li
and CH
but he
into th
full gra
blessed
Confirm
Kingdo
cost ; t
hands a
really
sincere
treated
dispens
and die
'better
—Bish
taught,
the Un
the spir
patriarc
says.²

But

'the Lo
Sacrame
part an
tual part

untraceable and inexplicable in its operation, than is the transmission of life in the natural order. So that our Lord's declaration, 'Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man and drink His blood, ye have no life in you,' is no mere metaphor nor figure of speech—such could never save us—but the expression of a truth which is perfectly consonant with and analogous to the admitted facts of life in the natural order, as experienced by those who are what they are by their participation, only too real, in the flesh and blood of the Old Adam.

And this life—real, supernatural, eternal—of which the Incarnate Son is the inexhaustible reservoir, for the healing, cleansing, and renewing of lost man, down to the deepest depths of his complex being, must be communicated, by the necessity of the case, to men individually and severally. The Sacraments are the means and instruments of that communication. A man may know all about Christianity; a man may, like the Emperor Constantine, believe all about Christ and Christianity that the Church and the Bible can tell him; but he is not a saved 'member of Christ' until he is grafted into the Second Adam by Baptism; nor can he receive the full grace of living union with Him, and the full and growing blessedness of the 'renewing of the Holy Ghost,' save by Confirmation and Communion. Such, as we must, with Bishop Kingdon, insist, is the ordinary way of salvation since Pentecost; though, in thus insisting, we freely admit that God's hands are not tied, that *Gratia non ligatur mediis*, and that really exceptional cases—i.e. cases where faith is full and sincere, but Sacraments cannot be had—may be exceptionally treated. With regard to the case of the saints of the elder dispensations—the 'spirits of just men' who, until Christ came, and died, 'received not the promise,' and who, in view of the 'better covenant,' could not 'without us be made perfect'¹—Bishop Kingdon teaches, as the Catholic Church has ever taught, that the Soul and Spirit of Jesus, on its passage into the Unseen State, 'went and heralded forth His Gospel to the spirits in safe-keeping,' 'that He might there make the patriarchs and prophets partakers of Himself,' as Tertullian says.²

But for those still in the flesh

'the Lord Jesus instituted the sacred means of grace which we call Sacraments, which have, by His appointment, a heavenly and spiritual part and also an earthly and visible part; the invisible and spiritual part being attached to and conveyed by the visible and material

¹ Heb. xi. 39.

² *De Anima*, lv.

part in some mysterious manner, in consequence of His appointment' (p. 133).

We need scarcely say that, after so clear a statement of the general principle, the nature and design of Sacraments as means for the communication, to all who are capable of receiving them, of the benefits which flow from the Incarnation and from union with the Incarnate Lord, we find in the volume before us a careful treatment of the Sacraments and sacramental ordinances of the Church in detail. Especially noticeable is the full exposition of the nature and value of Confirmation as the necessary completion of Baptism, as the communication of 'the gift of the Holy Ghost' by the laying on of Apostolic hands, without which, following upon regeneration, but as 'a separate act,' even Baptism itself 'was incomplete in its full privilege' (p. 146, &c.) Bishop Kingdon observes:

'It is rather remarkable that in the English and American Church the sign of the cross should be retained in Baptism (when probably it is a relic of Confirmation), and be omitted in the service for Confirmation itself. This is a surviving symptom, probably, of the time when Confirmation was administered immediately after Baptism. The shortness of the service is another surviving token that it is only part of a longer service, which also may be seen from the fact that, until the last review in 1661, the Lord's Prayer was not included in the service. This could not have been left out had it been intended to be a separate service for a separate rite. . . . For nine centuries Baptism was not allowed (except in danger of death) to be administered at other times than at Easter and Pentecost. Then catechumens were baptized at the cathedral church in the presence of the Bishop, who at once confirmed them. At present the rubric of the English Church directs that no adult baptism should take place without the Bishop being informed. One object is that the Baptism do not take place hurriedly, without sufficient preparation; but another, doubtless, is that the Bishop may appoint a time for the Baptism, that he may be present and confirm at once' (p. 151).¹

We are aware of much evidence of the truth of the remark (Appendix, p. 235) that

'there is now a strong feeling that we must return to the primitive teaching about the truth of the especial grace of Confirmation—viz.

¹ There is a curious witness to the more ancient practice of early Confirmation and to the feeling which had grown up as a result of it, in the concluding Rubric prefixed to the Service in the reformed Prayer Book of 1549: 'And that no man shall think that any detriment shall come to children by deferring of their Confirmation, he shall know for truth that it is certain by God's Word that children being baptized (if they depart out of life in their infancy) are undoubtedly saved.'

what t
langua
Christ
Power
Hands

In the
thank
render
marka
practic
the fir
Appen
be kno
quite a
logical
nothin
thorou
achiev
and co
studios
him so

Re
in the
'Ghost'
express
mony v
Public
to whic
Old Ca
retaine
The tru
be best
only.
and ple
actions-
Baptism
Easter m
at Pente
felt from
which h
the occa
their ful

¹ We
useful Tr
Oxford, 1
VOL. 2

what the Archbishop of Canterbury has so well said: "No thread of language and history is more distinct than that which connects Christ's promise of the coming of the Paraclete, to be an indwelling Power in all His chosen ones, with the institute of the laying on of Hands by the Apostles" (*The Seven Gifts*, p. 87).

In that 'strong feeling' we may earnestly concur; and we thank the Bishop very heartily for the valuable help he has rendered to those who share it by the painstaking and remarkably full catena of Catholic authorities on this most practically important subject, through all the centuries, from the first to the present, which he has presented to us in his Appendix MM (pp. 235-251)—pages which, as they come to be known as extensively as we trust they will be, will form quite a mine of interesting and helpful study to every theological student and to every parish priest. It is, indeed, nothing less than remarkable that so complete a specimen of thoroughly careful and exhaustive research should have been achieved by one—bishop or other—whose incessant occupation and continual movement must not only so greatly abridge his studious leisure, but must also, for long periods, withdraw him so completely from the reach of books.

Returning, as is natural, to the subject of Confirmation in the concluding Lecture (vii.), on 'The Gift of the Holy Ghost,' Bishop Kingdon alludes to the very ancient and most expressive use of the holy oil, or chrism, in that rite—a ceremony which, it is strange, was retained in the office of 1549 for Public Baptism, while it was omitted in that for Confirmation, to which occasion it more properly belongs. In the reformed Old Catholic Ritual of 1875 the ancient anointings are still retained in the Offices both of Baptism and Confirmation.¹ The true significance of the ancient unction or chrism would be best preserved by its restriction to the rite of Confirmation only. The general principle of Sacraments, the use, as tokens and pledges of inward spiritual action, of outward things and actions—such as the Dove at or immediately after our Lord's Baptism, His Breathing on the assembled disciples on the Easter night, the rushing mighty Wind and the Tongues of Fire at Pentecost—more than warrant, as the Church seems to have felt from the earliest days, the use of an expressive ceremony, which has abundant precedent in Old Testament usage, on the occasion when baptized Christians were to be lifted to their full position as kings and priests in the Church of God's

¹ We would commend to Liturgical students the Rev. F. E. Warren's useful *Translation of the Offices of the Old Catholic Prayer-Book* (Parker: Oxford, 1876).

redeemed, and so empowered to take their place and part in the offering of its highest act of worship.

The pages devoted (in the lecture on 'The Sacraments') to the subjects of Confession and Absolution, which are so often, quite needlessly, the occasion of much misunderstanding, are highly interesting. The 'precious declaration' of our Lord—'That ye may know that the Son of Man hath power on earth to forgive sins'—is carefully explained, reference being made to Canon Cooke's 'most valuable treatise,' *On the Power of the Priesthood in Absolution*, from which (Appendix DD, p. 226) we find reprinted the commentary—somewhat remarkable at that period—on the healing of the palsied man, in the *Essay on Miracles* of Bishop Fleetwood, chaplain to William III.

Advancing to the consideration of the Holy Eucharist, we find due prominence is given to the 'one universal peculiarity of sacrifice which was in existence' (it might have been added, from the very earliest ages of which we have any record) 'throughout the whole known world, Gentile as well as Jewish,' viz. 'its accompaniment with the offering of Bread and Wine.' Needless to say, the Bishop exhibits fully the sacrificial elements of the Christian Liturgy as in union with Christ's own continual pleading of 'His Sacrifice and the merits of His Blood in the Holy of Holies in Heaven.' Equally, while protesting earnestly against the late mediæval notion of Transubstantiation, and against the really sacrilegious mutilation of Christ's ordinance by the withdrawal from the Christian laity of the Chalice of the Blood,¹ he, at the same time, contends earnestly for the primitive and Scriptural truth of an absolutely real, though² spiritual, communication² of the life-giving Body and Blood of Christ, the Second Adam, the 'quickening Spirit.' In this part of his work he naturally makes use of the valuable work of the late Archdeacon Freeman, *The Principles of Divine Service*—a work in which the meaning of the universal adjunct of the offering of Bread and Wine in connection with the ancient sacrifices, and that very remarkably among Gentiles as well as Jews, and its relation to the animal sacrifices, was first sufficiently pointed out to our own generation; and in which attention was first drawn to the providential preparation, which the prevalence of this usage really was, for the general substitution, as the Church spread itself throughout the world, of the

¹ See p. 167 for the language of Pope Gelasius, preserved in the *Decretum of Gratian*.

² 1 Cor. x. 16.

memo
in the

Aft
Last S

'Eac
Eucharis
sacrifice
this" it i
For the
or keepin
any accu
worship.
By it the
which act
Which it

On t
Bishop's
guarded
ordinanc
and drin
alike by
her Litu
Church;
which, in
upheld b
exposure
modern
quoted a
Octave o
De Sacra
rectly in
Breviary,
point is t
Christ, W
it was H
tanta. vis
quæ non
erant *et*
the Roma

¹ Ed. Be
1845, tom. i
² The no
the words '
quanto mag
its origin or
requires the

memorial and representative Sacrifice which Christ ordained in the Upper Chamber on the Paschal night.

After describing the solemn incidents of 'that mysterious Last Supper,' he remarks :

'Each word, each act, was sacrificial ; the Sacrament of the Eucharist, therefore, has ever been regarded as the Christian sacrifice or offering from the very first. Even from the words "Do this" it is impossible to exclude the meaning of sacrifice or offering. For the word was ever used in the Greek Septuagint for Sacrifice, or *keeping* the Passover, or other feast, and even absolutely, without any accusative, in the sense of offering to a false god, and so of worship. It is the memorial of the one Sacrifice on the Cross. By it the value of that Sacrifice is extended to us. It is a symbol which actually conveys 'verily and indeed' to the faithful That of Which it is a symbol' (p. 160).

On the Communion aspect of the Holy Eucharist the Bishop's language is equally clear and definite, and carefully guarded and balanced. The blessed reality of the holy ordinance in which we 'spiritually eat the Flesh of Christ and drink His Blood' is unhesitatingly affirmed, as taught alike by Holy Scripture and by the language and usages, in her Liturgies and otherwise, of the primitive and undivided Church ; and due warning is given of the heretical novelties which, in this as in other matters, have been introduced and upheld by the modern Church of Rome. Very notable is his exposure, after Aubertin, of the shameless falsification in the modern editions of the Roman Breviary, of the passage quoted as the Fifth Lesson on the Wednesday within the Octave of the Festival of Corpus Christi. It is from the *De Sacramentis*, ascribed to St. Ambrose, and is given correctly in the Benedictine edition of his works, and in the Breviary, manuscript and printed, at least up to 1522. Its point is to illustrate the powerful working of the word of Christ, Whose word it is that consecrates the Sacraments, as it was His word by which all things were made, 'Si ergo tanta. vis est in sermone Domini Jesu, ut inciperent esse quæ non erant : quanto magis operatorius est, ut *sint* quæ erant *et* in aliud commutentur !'¹ The modern editions of the Roman Breviary omit the words we have italicized !²

¹ Ed. Bened. Paris, 1610, tom. ii. col. 569 ; also Migne's ed. Paris, 1845, tom. ii. col. 440.

² The note of the Benedictines seals the text as we have given it with the words 'Ita vet. edit. ac MSS.,' adding 'excepto cod. Illid. ubi, *quanto magis . . . quæ erant totum omittitur.*' This omission, whatever its origin or motive, obviously could not stand, for the preceding *quanto* requires the *tanta*. The 'Roman edition' followed Lanfranc, who says

Ordination, affirmed to be 'not only an outward call or recognition of one set apart or admitted to ministerial position,' but also 'a means of grace' and 'of a sacramental character,' is treated of in connexion with the Holy Eucharist, as being the 'setting apart a consecrated ministry to represent on earth the High Priest, the Chief Guide and Ruler, the Chief Shepherd, and to consecrate the holy Sacrament in His Name.' Then, after a brief mention of 'Holy Matrimony' and 'Extreme Unction,' the underlying idea of the sacramental element in Christianity is concisely stated, in conclusion, in the following words:

'all sacraments and sacramentals . . . are visible means of imparting to the faithful individually the participation of the benefits procured for all in general by the Incarnation' (p. 169).

In the concluding Lecture the Bishop expresses the opinion that the Bible revelation as to the Holy Spirit has not yet been fully realized and formulated, and that the misunderstanding between East and West as to the *Filioque* clause is one evidence of this. He says (p. 174), 'At the present moment the one great desideratum in theology is a full treatise on the Doctrine of the Holy Ghost.' And, again:

'Still there is much to be revealed about the glorious Third Person of the Ever-Blessed Trinity. There are hints and images in Scripture which evidently have reference to Him, which are still without explanation' (p. 180).

This is true, and the recent writings of the Bishop (Webb) of Grahamstown, of the Rev. W. H. Hutchings,¹ and of our own Primate,² are a happy evidence that the Blessed Spirit of God is Himself drawing the thoughts of theologians in our own generation towards Himself and His Office and Work in the Church of God. Speaking generally of these, our author points out that it belongs to the Holy Spirit to 'carry on to completion what the Word has inaugurated,'

that 'some MSS.' read *ut quæ erant in aliud commutentur.*³ The alteration was duly noted by Aubertin, *De Sacramento Eucharistia*, lib. ii. p. 510. The laboured note of the Benedictines is curious, but does not get over the difficulty of so notable a discrepancy.

¹ To these we thankfully add the recent volume, *Veni Creator*, by the Rev. H. C. G. Moule—a devout and helpful book, as are all Mr. Moule's writings; somewhat defective, indeed, and hesitating on the sacramental side of Christian truth and life, but far on the way towards a complete surrender to full New Testament teaching and Catholic belief.

² *The Seven Gifts.*

and to
unity is
of God.

'The
created,
tion we
the Son,
to bring
be seen
work of
tions ma
Inspirati
choose
choose o
events a
for the C
special r
find that
carry on
existence
true in th
Church'

Som
remarks
relation
a directi
difficulti
documen
tions wh
essays in
closing l
cation of
in primit
marked a

ART. VI

1. *Den I*
L. N
2. *Histor*
benh

MANY of
in the sun

and to be 'the life of the Church,' whereby 'her corporate unity is maintained, and whereby she grows with the increase of God.' He says :

'The work of establishing and perfecting that, which the Son has created, is the special work of the Holy Spirit. Thus at the Creation we read that, when the creature had been granted and given by the Son, then the Spirit of God brooded over the face of the waters, to bring the work to perfection. There is also a similar relation to be seen between Revelation and Inspiration ; Revelation is the work of the Word . . . Inspiration is by the Holy Spirit. Revelations may be for a local, personal, or temporal purpose, whereas Inspiration is for all time. Inspiration enables the subject of it to choose out of the Revelations, or, as in the Old Testament, to choose out of the history of God's dealings with His people, such events as have, whether as types or otherwise, an interest and value for the Gospel times, and so for all time. In this, too, is seen the special relation of the Holy Spirit to God the Word. Similarly, we find that in the New Creation the work of the Holy Spirit is to carry on to perfection that which the Creator Word has called into existence, to perfect the work which the Son has initiated. This is true in the Church at large, and in each individual member of the Church' (p. 183).

Some deeply and importantly true and far-reaching remarks are embodied in this passage. The hint about the relation of Inspiration to Revelation might be worked out in a direction very helpful towards the solution of some of the difficulties raised by modern criticism on the Old Testament documents, and towards throwing light on some of the questions which have been brought into prominence by one of the essays in *Lux Mundi*. And the truth expressed in the closing lines might receive an apt illustration from the Invocation of the Holy Spirit upon the Sacred Elements which, in primitive and (we cannot doubt) Apostolic usage, was a marked and invariable feature in the Antient Liturgies.

ART. VIII.—THE LOSS OF THE SUCCESSION IN DENMARK.

1. *Den Danske Kirkes Historie*. [Five vols. 8vo.] Ved Dr. L. N. HELVEG. (Kjöbenhavn, 1870.)
2. *Historiske Aarbøger*. Udgivne af C. MOLBECH. (Kjöbenhavn, 1845, 1848, 1851.)

MANY of the English people who now resort to Scandinavia in the summer must be struck, when they first spend a Sunday

there, with what they find in the native Churches. They see crucifixes and elaborate reredoses—often dating from the middle ages, and ‘idolatrous’ beyond anything that St. Paul’s has ever been accused of; they see the vestments worn, candles lighted, wafers used. The service is called by the name of ‘High Mass,’ the officiating minister the ‘priest.’ He sings the office to regular (though not Gregorian) modes; he absolves each intending communicant singly before the service begins with imposition of hands; he blesses the people with the sign of the cross. When service is over he departs through the streets in his reverend and comely cassock, with its picturesque sixteenth-century ruff.

But beneath this interesting and promising exterior there is much which disappoints. The enquirer soon learns—to mention nothing else—that the minister himself, in Denmark at least (whatever doubts may be entertained about Sweden), frankly abandons any idea of having the apostolical succession as it is usually understood, and, although ordained by an officer bearing the title of ‘bishop,’ has received nothing but a presbyterian ordination, the ultimate authority for which, in the year 1537, lies in a singularly bold breach with ancient order, in an act of solemn purpose to start a new system of things.

The history of the loss of the succession in Denmark is curious and sad. Perhaps no more striking illustration could be given of the truth of that warning, which, according to the famous legend, was heard from heaven when Constantine made his Donation to the Church. It was the wealth and worldly power to which the Danish bishops had attained, which brought about the calamity by exposing that order, even more than in other countries, not only to the cupidity of the nobles and the hatred of the people, but also to the temptation to retain at all hazards what they had. Perhaps there was no country in which the political influence and the territorial dominion of the bishops were so great. It would hardly be too much to say that the prelates, at the end of the reign of King John, were the supreme power in the State.¹

¹ The kingdom of Denmark, at the time of which we are speaking, comprised the district called Skaane, in the south of what is now Sweden. In this district is situated the city of Lund. The Archbishop of Lund was metropolitan of the Danish Church, besides exercising a more than nominal primacy over Sweden, and enjoying the dignity of *legatus natus* for the whole north. Within the province of Lund lay seven dioceses besides that of Lund itself, namely Roskilde in Sjælland, and Odense in Fyen, and on the continent of Jylland, Børglum, Aarhus, Viborg, and Ribe, together with that of Slesvig, which, although under the jurisdiction of Lund, was not an integral part of the Danish kingdom.

The
three a
kings, C
I.
power
mark h
the elec
the case
Sweden
however
obtained
Rigsraa
ral. On
solemn
was said
soul's sa
as were
his succ
disappre
manifest
conduct
wishes o

No J
raad put
year 15
an absol
were the
more th
article in
'if, which
ment, an
our Rigsr
fully help
no wise
to us.'¹

Probably
notion h
the hard
of ascen
nobles—
his father
the com

The duchy
and in an
¹ Helv

The drama of their downfall divides itself naturally into three acts, corresponding to the reigns of three successive kings, Christian II., Frederick I., and Christian III.

I. When Christian II. came to the throne, the royal power had fallen lower than it had ever done before. Denmark had for a long time been an elective monarchy, although the election generally fell to the nearest heir. The same was the case with the half-independent kingdoms of Norway and Sweden, and with the duchies of Slesvig and Holsteen, which, however, in the main elected as king the man who had already obtained the crown of Denmark. The election lay with the Rigsraad—or council of the great nobles, spiritual and temporal. On each such occasion, it was the practice for the Rigsraad solemnly to review the reign of the deceased king, partly, as it was said, on the dead man's own account, 'for the sake of his soul's salvation,' in order that such remedies for his misdeeds as were possible might be used, partly in order to point out to his successor those features of his policy of which the electors disapproved. Thereupon the newly-elected king issued a manifesto or edict, announcing the principles by which his conduct would be governed, and naturally embodied in it the wishes of his electors, and to this he took his oath.

No Danish king had ever had his lesson from the Rigsraad put in so humiliating a form as Christian II. had in the year 1513. His electors claimed in the haughtiest language an absolute freedom of choice, which made it appear that they were the true masters of the realm, and that he was nothing more than their delegate. They made him sign, as the last article in his manifesto, the declaration, that

'if, which God forbid, we do anything contrary to this our agreement, and will not allow ourselves to be instructed thereupon by our Rigsraad, then shall all the inhabitants of the kingdom faithfully help to resist the same, without loss of honour, and shall in no wise by so doing break the oath of fealty which they made to us.'¹

Probably even those who dictated this declaration had no notion how prophetic it was. There can be no doubt that the hard terms imposed upon Christian II. as the condition of ascending his throne increased that aversion from the nobles—especially the prelates—which had shown itself in his father's lifetime, and helped to drive him into the arms of the commons, and to make him welcome the movement of

The duchy of Holsteen, further south, lay under the Bishop of Lübeck, and in another province.

¹ Helveg, iii. 512.

Church Reform. For the rest, the immunities which Christian promised, especially to the Church, were for the most part such as his predecessors had promised before him. No grave matters of doctrine or discipline were yet under discussion; a few of the articles show how the main questions agitated in the Church were now questions of property, in which the interests of the spirituality and of the secular nobility were at conflict. Thus the Rigsraad complained that monasteries, founded, as they averred, by the gentry, not by the Crown, were impoverished by the way in which the Crown had used them as a source of maintenance for its lay favourites. The religious purpose of these foundations had almost been lost sight of, and they were regarded as eligible places for younger sons and daughters of good families. Or, again, it was demanded that when men 'not free-born'—for the condition of the working classes, especially of the peasantry, was one of serfdom—had acquired freehold of land, as was the case, for instance, with the then Archbishop of Lund, such land should not pass on their demise to their heirs of unfree birth, but should be sold to those who were free.

For some years King Christian reigned quietly enough. He was a man not devoid of sagacity in political affairs, and of more culture than many princes of his time. He consolidated his position by successful alliances abroad. No less a person than the Emperor welcomed him to affinity by giving him the hand of his grand-daughter, the sister of the future Charles V. Advantageous treaties were also formed with England and with Muscovy, and friendly relations maintained with the Pope and with neighbouring German courts. But Christian's chief aim was to promote the commerce of his country and the well-being of its trading towns. Holland was the country which he took for his model; and, much to the disgust of many old-fashioned Danes, he imported a colony of Dutch people into the island of Amager opposite Copenhagen, to show what could be done in Denmark in the way of gardening and the cultivation of fruit and vegetables.

In the fourth year of Christian's reign, the summer of 1516, troubles began. Sweden was a possession which always cost the Danish sovereigns dear; and now the Swedish 'Forstander' or regent, made a move for his country's liberties, which led not only to the greatest crime of Christian's life, but also to his breach with the Danish lords, especially with the lords spiritual. The Archbishop of Upsala, Gustav Trolle, was a devoted partisan of Denmark, and soon after his appointment provoked the resentment of the Forstander, his

heredit
to the
mark.
formid
assumi
Birger
pronou
upon, s
pronou
castle s
encroa
wonder
sanctio
appear

The
Money
Swedis
pay the
busines
had en
Sture,
life, lea
years, i
fied Le
his leg
Swedis
the 'se

Per
much
broker.
money
it was
fabrics
sacred
The bis
every y
which
still mo
absolve
the bis
mande
year of
a third
of the
kilde, '

hereditary enemy, Steen Sture. When Steen Sture laid siege to the Archbishop's castle, Trolle appealed for help to Denmark. Not deaf to his appeal, Christian began to prepare a formidable armament to relieve him, and at the same time, assuming the position of the Church's defender, prevailed upon Birger of Lund, in his character of Primate of Sweden, to pronounce excommunication upon the assailant. Sture, thereupon, summoned the National Council, and, with its authority, pronounced that Trolle was deposed from his see, and that his castle should be razed to the ground. This was an unheard-of encroachment upon ecclesiastical rights, and it is not to be wondered at that the excommunication received the full sanction of Arcimbold, a papal legate, who at this juncture appeared upon the scene, charged with the sale of Indulgences.

The mission of Arcimbold proved a windfall for Christian. Money was the king's chief need, for the prosecution of his Swedish war. To begin with, the legate, as was usual, had to pay the sovereign a good round sum for leave to carry on his business; and not long afterwards it was discovered that he had entered upon a treasonable correspondence with Steen Sture, in consequence of which he was obliged to fly for his life, leaving all his indulgence-money, the fruit of three busy years, in the hands of the indignant king. However mortified Leo X. might be, he could do nothing but apologise for his legate's conduct, approve the excommunication of the Swedish commander, and formally call upon Christian to be the 'secular arm' which should enforce it.

Perhaps neither laity nor clergy in Denmark saw with much regret the discomfiture of the foreign indulgence-broker. It came closer home when the King began to wring money out of the Church on his own account. At one time it was the money due for the maintenance of ecclesiastical fabrics which fell into his hands; at another a share of the sacred vessels, jewels, and other valuables from the altars. The bishops, the chapters, the monasteries were called upon every year for a 'loan' of so many thousand ounces of silver, which came out of the sacristies of their churches. By a still more daring stretch of power the King from time to time absolved the parish clergy from paying customary dues to the bishops; and then, in return for his consideration, demanded larger contributions to his own treasury. In the last year of his reign the amount of this impost was no less than a third of the income of each benefice, and of the furniture of the priests' houses. 'The King,' said the Bishop of Roskilde, 'has taken from me my jurisdiction, and spoiled and

ground down the Holy Church, my priests, my clerks, and my churchwardens' (p. 578).

The state of his exchequer about this time drove Christian II. to attack a great ecclesiastic of the realm. He made a politic selection. If it was possible to enlist the approval of the secular lords when one of their spiritual peers was outraged, Christian chose his man aright. There was probably no one alive whom the nobles more cordially detested than Jens Andersen, commonly called 'Beldenak,' Bishop of Odense. The son of a cobbler in Jylland, Jens had worked his way up in the late reign, through the royal Chancery, by his consummate skill in law. Once in high place, he had established an unbounded influence over the somewhat weak mind of King John—an influence maintained by compliances which it would be charitable to call unscrupulous. Jens lost no opportunity of teaching the haughty nobles that, however they might despise his birth, they could not despise his power or his ability. The Queen herself, John's wife, had to put up with the insolence of the upstart prelate. To the mind of Christian II. Jens was the embodiment of the power which most cramped his own. If the crown was to be strong the lords must be humbled; and if the lords were to be humbled he must begin with the bishops; and among them there was none against whom he could so safely proceed as the Bishop of Odense. Towards the close of John's reign Jens, as the king's plenipotentiary, had purchased peace with Lübeck for a large sum of money, for which he and the Duke of Holsteen made themselves responsible. Under the influence of his son Christian, King John had repudiated the liability, betokening thus the downfall of his favourite's power. The matter had long been lost to sight. But now Christian demanded that the money should be put in his hands. The Bishop refused, but in vain. Although the papal legate, Arcimbold (whose treason had not yet been discovered), was on the spot, and was astonished at the eloquence and ability of the Bishop's defence, he was arrested. For two years the unfortunate man was hurried from dungeon to dungeon, in spite of the remonstrances of Rome. The Cardinal-Protector pointed out to Christian the inconsistency of his conduct, to be at one and the same time figuring as the Church's champion against Sture for his attack upon the Archbishop of Upsala, and yet dealing in so similar a manner with a bishop of his own. At last the recalcitrant prelate was brought to a compromise. Both parties agreed to refer the dispute to three episcopal arbitrators, who decided that Jens must beg pardon of the King and his mother, and

for the
revenue

But
some
Oden
Swed
the v
had si
offen
such
were
judge
them
—a C
Court
credit
to be
of Bl
almos
anoth
Gusta
the R
Jens
the co
was l
that l
the op
extin
mark
especi
his th

Th
satisfi
ment
power
vacan
The c
vilege
while
Skod
posse
King
Born
side i
had th

for the rest of his life must pay to the King two-thirds of the revenues of his see.

Being now set free from his captivity, and perhaps under some secret understanding with the King, the Bishop of Odense accompanied Christian to his next year's campaign in Sweden and its horrible ending. Steen Sture was dead, and the victory was the more easily won. The trial of those who had sided with him followed. It was reckoned an ecclesiastical offence—nay, with a knowledge of all that was involved in such a charge, it was declared an 'open heresy.' The judges were all ecclesiastics. Gustav Trolle was one of them—a judge in his own cause. Jens of Odense presided. With them was associated—though probably not as an actual judge—a German confidential agent between the King and the Court of Rome named Diedrich Slaghek, who is generally credited with being the chief mover in what was thenceforth to be known in Scandinavian history as 'the Stockholm Bath of Blood.' On one day (November 8, 1520) ninety persons, almost all of noble Swedish families, were executed one after another in the market-place. The first to suffer—though Gustav Trolle had barely put their names upon his list—were the Bishops of Strengnaes and Skara. To the vacant sees Jens and Diedrich were nominated, and the government of the country was entrusted to a commission, of which Diedrich was head, and Jens and Trolle members. Christian hoped that by this reign of terror he had crushed the life out of the opposition; but it only created among the Swedes an extinguishable fear and hatred of Denmark, and in Denmark itself the Bath of Blood and its sequel raised feelings, especially in the minds of the prelates, which cost Christian his throne.

The ambition and cupidity of Diedrich Slaghek were not satisfied by the revenues of the see of Skara and the government of Sweden. The see of Lund, the wealthiest and most powerful post in the three kingdoms, had been for some time vacant, by the death of Archbishop Birger in December 1519. The cathedral chapter, indeed, outrunning its ancient privileges, had immediately elected its dean to the vacancy, while the King had nominated a servant of his own, George Skodborg, who at a later time came near to gaining actual possession of the see. Difficulties, however, soon arose. The King demanded of his nominee the cession of the island of Bornholm as the price of his investiture, while from the other side it appeared that Leo, on hearing of Birger's death, had had the unprecedented insolence to appoint a youthful Italian

favourite of his, 'provisionally,' as the phrase ran. This daring act of Leo's, more than anything else, caused the eventual loss of Denmark to the Papacy. Skodborg could not bring himself to weaken his position by complying with the King's demand, nor was he able to raise enough ready money to buy out the young Cardinal; consequently his nomination remained ineffective. During Birger's lifetime, Diedrich Slaghek had intrigued at Rome to secure for himself the succession, and now, persuading the King that Skodborg's position was untenable, he obtained the King's presentation to the archbishopric, and settled accounts with Leo's favourite. Scarcely, however, had he been enthroned—he was never consecrated—when events took an unfavourable turn. Christian was more and more exasperated at the failure of his Swedish triumphs. A new Roman legate was coming, or come, to investigate the circumstances of the murder of the two bishops; and at this juncture Jens of Odense returned from Sweden, where Gustav Vasa, the new Forstander, was carrying all before him. Jens was the first to feel his sovereign's displeasure. He was once more arrested and delivered into the custody of his new metropolitan.

'At Christmas,' says an old Danish writer, 'came Master Diedrich to him in the prison, to advise him, with diabolical kindness, that he must prepare himself to die, and therefore ought to make his will. Whereto Bishop Jens answered, "Write thou that I shall live to see the day when thou shalt be both hanged and burnt"' (p. 570).

His prophecy was fulfilled. On January 24, 1522, the Archbishop elect was horribly put to death in the marketplace at Copenhagen, in the presence of the Papal legate, for the crimes in which he had led the way in Sweden, while the Bishop of Odense, who was daily expecting the same fate, owed his deliverance to the men of Lübeck, who surprised the place where he happened to be imprisoned, and carried him off to Lübeck, where he lived until Christian's flight.

Diedrich's execution, while in reality it gratified the King's disappointed rage, was intended by him to have the appearance of an expiation of the Bath of Blood, but he can scarcely have expected that the Church and the world would so regard it, or would on that account hold him guiltless for the Swedish massacre. The Papal legate, indeed, was powerless. Christian's representative at Rome succeeded in counteracting the effect of his report of what had happened, and Leo X., though he counselled penance for the slaughter of the 'three bishops,' took no further action against the Emperor's

broth
alarm
'You
year
but y
Holy
episc

W
power
oppos
some
matic
mus i
remed
first s

It
utteri
reform
III.
were
formi
toward
forwa
in 147
and d
place,
on co

lectur
1519-
Its su
know
Paul
Danis
not by
the C
Catho
ferenc
ancien
his fir
Christ
count
while
fallen
own to
conver

brother-in-law. But Christian had succeeded in thoroughly alarming and alienating the Church of his own country. 'Your Grace was advised by the clergy of Rome,' so wrote a year later the best of the Danish bishops, 'to do penance; but you did not and would not do it. You mocked our Most Holy Father the Pope, the Cardinals of Holy Church, and the episcopal order and dignity' (p. 574).

While Christian II. was thus endeavouring to break the power of the prelates by violence, he was provoking them into opposition by ways less discreditable to himself. It had for some years past been his desire to see something of a reformation in the Church; and once in 1521, when he met Erasmus in Holland, he burst out with the exclamation, 'Gentle remedies will do no good: the most effectual are those which first shake the whole body.'

It would be untrue to suggest that even at the moment of uttering this speech it was Christian II.'s desire to see such a reformation effected as that which was effected by Christian III. Probably he meant no more at the time than many who were afterwards driven into reaction by the violence of the reforming movement. One of the earliest steps which he took towards the execution of his plan was the means of bringing forward such a man. The University of Copenhagen, founded in 1475 under his grandfather, had been shamefully neglected and defrauded. To throw some life into the studies of the place, Christian II. founded a Carmelite house in Copenhagen, on condition of maintaining a graduate in divinity who should lecture daily in the University. The house began its work in 1519—the year in which our English reformer, Colet, died. Its superior and lecturer was one who has been commonly known to his countrymen since by the opprobrious name of Paul Turncoat, but who deserved a better. Danish born and Danish bred, a disciple of Erasmus—but through his books, not by personal intercourse—himself the Erasmus, or at least the Colet of Denmark, Paul began his career as an ardent Catholic reformer; and though, later, he resented the interference of foreign agitators, and the ruthless breach with ancient order which they introduced, he never withdrew from his first position, nor denied his sympathy to what was truly Christian in the Reformation. In after days he bitterly recounted the names of the students who had sat at his feet while he was Professor at Copenhagen, and had afterwards fallen away to Lutheranism, without seeing how much his own teaching had had to do with it. His earnest and unconventional lectures, like those of Colet at Oxford, brought

him into collision with the representatives of the past system of learning.

'I have striven,' he wrote to a friend, 'with all my might to promote serious studies, but I have had only slight success, on account of the folly of the old people, who would rather have ignorance supreme, than that they should lose any of their dignity as Rabbis and Doctors, and therefore exclaim that those are heretics who expound Christ or Paul or Peter in the school' (p. 544).

We seem in these utterances to hear the very voice of the author of the *Colloquia*.

Christian II.'s desire to make the University a centre of reform did not stop with having set Paul Eliesen to work. He turned first to Louvain to find teachers of law, and then to his uncle, Frederick, Elector of Saxony, for teachers of divinity from his new University of Wittenberg. To us, at this distance of time, it may seem as if that step committed Christian to all that Lutheranism developed into; but the historian of the Danish Church well warns us that it was not so at the moment. Luther was everywhere known as a learned and enthusiastic divine, who might have been rash in some of his actions, and wrong in some of his ideas; but so had many others been without becoming heresiarchs. Two German professors came. Paul Eliesen was ready to interpret for them when they preached in one of the churches in the town. The scholastic reformation seemed to go on smoothly, with no more serious opposition than a laugh when the canons of St. Mary's, at the carnival, set a buffoon to take off the zealous Professors' action in the pulpit. Luther, whom the King had invited to come in person to Denmark, wrote in March 1521, 'King Christian persecutes the Papists, and has forbidden his University to condemn me and mine'—doubtless referring (without great exactitude) to the King's action against the prelates, and his (probable) refusal to allow the Pope's bull against Luther to be published.

It was not so remarkable a thing for a king to forbid the publication of a papal bull; but shortly after (in May 1521) came the more formidable imperial echo of the same from the Diet of Worms. Denmark was not within the bounds of the Holy Roman Empire; but Christian was not prepared to run exactly counter to his great brother-in-law. He sent word to his German professors, who were in Germany at the time, that he no longer required their services. But it was too late for him to make the clergy at home feel that he was at one with them. Paul Eliesen himself, though still ardent for reform, thought that the King had gone too far—in the

direction
Once (i
straight
answer
what h
heretica
last, on
before
crueltie
house w
in fear
diocese
sity, and
greatly
greatnes
tical au
endowed
ture in
people, a
party ra
Paul Tu
Urne cre
dangerou
and it de
reprove
natural i
trines of
tyrant w

Mean
who led
Paul and
Christian
up chiefly
with trad
his reign
and in 15
by which,
to carry
desired en
as an aut
free and f
was in its
order to
Rigsraad
did not ge

direction of Lutheran tenets, as well as of crime and violence. Once (if Paul has not coloured the story) the King asked him straight what he thought of Luther and his doctrine, and he answered, 'What Luther writes about morals is cynical, and what he writes against the Pope and Church usages is as heretical as can be,' which gave the King great offence. At last, on the feast of St. John's Beheading, 1522, he preached before the King with such point and force about royal cruelties, that Christian a week later dissolved the Carmelite house which he had founded, and Paul found himself obliged, in fear of his life, to take refuge with the bishop of the diocese, Lage Urne, who was also Chancellor of the University, and with Ove Bilde, Bishop of Aarhus, both of whom greatly admired the eager young scholar. To mark the greatness of the breach between the King and his ecclesiastical authorities, Bishop Urne immediately founded and endowed a new canonry in St. Mary's, the occupant to lecture in theology before the University and preach to the people, and presented Paul Eliesen to it. The bitterness of party rancour pointed to that canonry as the price for which Paul Turncoat sold himself to the bishops; but it does Lage Urne credit that he should have befriended a man who had so dangerous a reputation among the more old-fashioned people; and it does Paul credit that he should have had the courage to reprove the King's bloody mood; nor was it altogether unnatural if he then began to experience a reaction from doctrines of which (however little Christian understood them) the tyrant was to him the champion.

Meanwhile the tyrant had fallen into the hands of advisers who led him in a very different direction from that in which Paul and his aristocratic patrons would have led him. Christian II. is said in his childhood to have been brought up chiefly in the house of a tradesman in Copenhagen, and with tradesmen's children for his associates. All through his reign he had shown great partiality for the trading class, and in 1521 and 1522 he set forth two collections of laws, by which, if the hand which set them forth had had strength to carry them through, he might well have attained the desired end, of breaking the power of the nobles, and of ruling as an autocratic, hereditary sovereign, by the goodwill of a free and favoured commons. The publication of these laws was in itself an act of bold defiance to the aristocracy. In order to obtain legal validity, it was necessary that the Rigsraad should consent to the royal statutes; but Christian II. did not go through the formality of asking the approval of

that body. The laws were issued on his own authority, in conjunction with his privy council. Foremost in that privy council, along with a Dutch adventuress, known as Mother Sigbrit, who had obtained a strange ascendancy over the king, sat a Malmö merchant named Hans Mikkelsen, a bitter hater of the power of the lords, and an ardent partisan of the principles which were fast consolidating under the name of Lutheranism. Mikkelsen's influence was at once supported and tempered by that of a purer and gentler character, in the person of Christian Pedersen—the most attractive figure in Danish history on the reforming side—learned, devout, and retiring, though full of zeal, the first translator of the Bible into good Danish, and one who loved to gather up and preserve everything that could bind old and new together, and who deserved more thanks than he received for publishing the works of Saxo and other relics of Danish antiquity. At the time of which we are speaking he was still a Canon of Lund, and secretary to the new claimant of the archiepiscopal see, whom the King had set up in the place of Slaghek.

It is not our purpose to show here what points in Christian II.'s legislation were calculated to give particular offence to the lay lords; but for the ecclesiastical lords there was one enactment which they were sure to resist to the utmost. Not content, as others before him had been, with restricting the number of reserved cases which it was necessary to refer to the Pope—this fruitful source of revenue to the Roman Court had long been the subject of quarrels and concordats—the King ordered that no cases should henceforth be carried out of the country to the pecuniary loss of the kingdom. He established a Supreme Court for ecclesiastical affairs at Roskilde, to consist of 'four doctors or masters well learned in ecclesiastical and imperial law.' This court was to have power 'to judge in all spiritual matters, as well over bishops and priests as over all others in the kingdom.' Perhaps if Christian had known how to take his bishops into consultation, they might have been glad to aid him in stopping the ceaseless expense of carrying lawsuits to Rome; but their power was not yet so broken that they would be willing to submit themselves unreservedly to a court of four 'doctors or masters' appointed by the King's good pleasure alone. With regard to the bishops' own courts, the new laws made a sharp retrenchment in the kind of cases that were to be brought before them. Hitherto, the laity had been liable, as they complained, to be condemned and excommunicated for things which ought to come before the secular courts.

The
deal v

Pe
were t
perty
manne
one of
they sl
genera
not ha
withal.
some t
they pa
attenda
More d
show th
attenda
upon th
ordaine
at some
Holy G
quisition
in case '
take wiv
did.' F
the Nort
lation, or
reformer
Lutheran
selves aff
there wa
sive,' yet
forward t
force' (p.

But t
distinction
by the sy
grievances.
Viborg, w
nobility of
Duke of H
that princ
violence w
that he ha
holy Chris

VOL. XX

The spiritual courts were henceforth to have no power to deal with questions affecting property.

Perhaps still more offensive to the prelates personally were the laws which hindered them from increasing the property of their sees, and which even affected to regulate their manner of living. 'When bishops come to the king,' so ran one of these statutes, 'to a general parliament of the lords, they shall ride, or travel in their litters, that the people in general may know them from other doctors; but they shall not have fife and drum before them to mock Holy Church withal.' These lordly progresses of the bishops were burdensome to the clergy and laity of the parishes through which they passed, and therefore it was expressly stated how many attendants they might take with them on their visitations. More directly religious regulations there were, which seem to show the hand of Christian Pedersen, regarding the bishop's attendance at service in his cathedral, the residence of priests upon their cures, and the like. No man henceforth was to be ordained till he was of canonical age, nor until he had studied at some university, and could 'understand and preach the Holy Gospel and Epistle.' One passage, which forbids the acquisition of landed property by priests, makes an exception in case 'they will follow St. Paul's doctrine (1 Tim. iii.) that they take wives and live in matrimony as their ancient forefathers did.' Few points throughout the Reformation struggle in the North were more insisted on than this. The whole legislation, on its ecclesiastical side, is the work of a strenuous reformer, but bears little trace of anything distinctively Lutheran. Even enemies of the King who were not themselves affected by the new codes acknowledged that though there was 'much in them that was reprehensible and offensive,' yet they contained 'many profitable articles which set forward the public weal, and might therefore well continue in force' (p. 611).

But the Danish lords were not in a mood to draw these distinctions. Sjælland was in a state of insurrection, caused by the sympathetic way in which the new laws dealt with the grievances of the serfs. The new code was solemnly burnt at Viborg, where, headed by Ove Bilde, Bishop of Aarhus, the nobility of Jylland did homage to Christian's uncle, Frederick, Duke of Holsteen. In the petition with which they approached that prince the lords of Jylland reckoned up all the deeds of violence which Christian had committed, and among them that he had 'permitted heretics that were gone away from the holy Christian faith' to seduce the people 'with their Lutheran

points and knavery.' They turned to Frederick 'because he was born of Danish blood, and had until that day behaved himself before God and man like a Christian prince.' Foremost in their offers of service, the Jylland prelates promised him first their persons and their goods, and then 'the gold and silver, chalices and monstrances, crosses, images, and other valuables of the churches and monasteries.' While many of the secular lords held back in their castles, waiting to have the advantage of yielding to compulsion, the old Bishop of Børglum entreated the Duke 'with running tears' to help them in their necessity. Frederick met with no serious resistance on the continent, and the struggle was as good as ended, when Lage Urne on the island of Sjælland joined the insurgents. Before he did so he wrote his old master a letter of kindly counsel. The only answer was a proof of Mother Sigbrit's desire to have him hanged. Lage Urne escaped to Jylland, but still refrained from committing himself to Frederick and his friends. He asked a safe-conduct and an interview with the King.

'I have been a true liege to your Grace,' he wrote, 'and had I not been so things would long since have been very different. It is my humble request that your Grace will permit me and my cathedral to enjoy the benefit thereof, and that I may have your Grace's command and writing to that effect, which I may rely upon, for I believe still that I can treat to the advantage and lasting continuance of your Grace and the kingdom of Denmark' (p. 587).

The Bishop waited for the King's reply, but he got only a torrent of reproaches and abuse, and a fortnight later he wrote to renounce his allegiance.

'Your Grace,' he said proudly, 'need have no fear that I shall at any time disclose the secret words and conversations your Grace has had with me. I am not so insane as your Grace's advisers hold me for. I will, with God's help, give heed to my soul's salvation, my honour, and good name, and hope to be accounted one of the most honourable prelates in Denmark, that never has, nor ever will, betray any human being, not to speak of my lord and king.'

He called to mind the King's atrocities, and concluded:—

'For such accursed and cruel deeds I also am constrained to renounce, and now by this my open letter do renounce, allegiance, homage, and true service to your Grace in the name of Jesus, and will answer the same according to natural law and all written jurisprudence. The cross of Jesus Christ, the might and power of His blessed Death and Passion, the prayers of the Virgin Mary, Mother of God, and of all Saints, I invoke to come between the harm your

Grace
clergy,
'With
who r
Denm
Three
countr

Per
with cl
and th
kingdo
befrien
Luther
of meas
and al
many w
but als
authorit
count sp
to be tri
pline of
in the R
they sho
exempla
reforming
holm Bat
their all
mixed, a
for any re
loaded wi
to govern
Church.
remained
ment.

II. TH
sentative
He was t
All preter
choice, wa
not to req
realm, tha
him. Chr
void. All
lates over
consolidate

Grace thinks to do me, my cathedral, estate, and property, priests and clergy, and all my sacred diocese' (p. 588).

'With these words,' adds Dr. Helveg, 'he fell off—the man who might well be called the most honourable prelate in Denmark—and with him fell King Christian's best support.' Three days later, on April 13, 1523, Christian fled from the country, to return to it only as a miserable prisoner.

Perhaps if Christian II. had come to his work of reform with clean hands, he might have kept Lage Urne at his side, and through him some at least of the other bishops in the kingdom. It would not have been difficult for the men who befriended Paul Eliesen to find common ground with moderate Lutherans like Christian Pedersen. But the best and wisest of measures coming from Christian II. came at a disadvantage; and along with his good measures were mingled not only many which conflicted with the worldly interest of the prelates, but also many which rightly offended their sense of religious authority. When a king gravely established on his own account spiritual tribunals before which the bishops were liable to be tried, and issued statutes regulating the internal discipline of their dioceses without consulting them, either as lords in the Rigsraad or as bishops in synod, it was not strange that they should decline to accept such legislation, even from an exemplary sovereign, much more when the would-be leader in reforming the Church was the man who had ordered the Stockholm Bath of Blood. The motives of the prelates in transferring their allegiance from Christian to his uncle were doubtless mixed, as motives mostly are; but it was a very fair cloak for any reasons which they kept to themselves that the man so loaded with crimes, and so impenitent for them, was neither fit to govern the kingdom nor to be trusted to deal fairly with the Church. The encroachments and the crimes of Christian II. remained a standing prejudice against every reforming movement.

II. Thus Frederick I. came to the throne as the representative of a conservative reaction, both in State and Church. He was the king of the nobles—above all, of the prelates. All pretence of any other right to be king, save by their choice, was so entirely abandoned that Frederick promised not to require of the Rigsraad, or of the inhabitants of the realm, that his son or any other should be elected to succeed him. Christian II.'s new legislation was declared null and void. All powers before exercised by the lords and the prelates over their subjects were confirmed and extended. To consolidate more closely the interests of the temporal and

spiritual lords, it was actually agreed to make binding for all the bishoprics in the country what the Chapter of Lund had resolved upon for the primatial see—namely, that no one should be appointed bishop except he were a native of Denmark and born of a noble family. Finally, King Frederick was made to promise 'above all to love God, the Holy Church, and her ministers, and to suffer them to enjoy, use, and retain all the privileges and liberties which have been granted and given them by the Roman Church and by former kings,' and then 'that he would not permit any heretic, Luther's disciple, nor any other, to preach and teach, either privily or openly, against the holy faith, against the most Holy Father the Pope and the Church of Rome' (p. 625).

The position upon which Frederick I. thus entered was by no means enviable. His one hold over the men who had elected him lay in the fact that he was indispensable to them. They knew that if they let Frederick go there was nothing for it but to have Christian back. For this the trading interest and the peasantry were always ready, and abroad Denmark in its present condition was without a friend. Charles V., as was to be expected, bore no good-will to the men who had driven out his sister and her husband. The Electors of Saxony and Brandenburg, then the most powerful princes in North Germany, were also closely connected with Christian. The two rivals in religious influence, the Pope of the reforming party and the Pope of Rome, Martin Luther and Clement VII., were alike on the side of the 'lawful' King as against the usurper. The only powers to which Frederick could look for any support were the town of Lübeck on the one hand, whose interests were crossed by Christian's attempt to develop the commerce of his own country, and Gustav Vasa on the other, who owed the crown of Sweden to Christian's flight and to Frederick's unwillingness or impotence to put him down.

It was all that Frederick could do, for some years, to maintain his position without embarking upon any rash enterprises at home or abroad. The crown was, as usual, financially embarrassed; and, as usual, it was the Church which had to find the money. More than once, within the first few years of Frederick's reign, large subsidies were granted by the clergy in Denmark and in the duchies in exchange for a renewed promise from the King that he would do all in his power to put down Lutheranism. In this promise the Rigsraad and all the nobility solemnly joined in the summer of 1524, declaring that they, 'after the example of their honourable ancestors of past generations, would live and keep themselves

in obed
Roman
resist t
Brother
(p. 641)
by the b
made by

Dou

they we
little hea
too stron
which ex
them. I
their Pa
see of L
since the
Birger, a
to have c
uneasine
the welfa
Lund is
realm an
mark and
not unnat
filling-up
longer to
be so de
negotiat
See, for C
and was
de facto
reign wh
Rome ad
accepted
merly bec
nounced
so far as
letter from
neither the
his positio
dinal upon
'provision
down, whic
and promis
to claim th

in obedience to our most Holy Father the Pope and the Roman Church, and that they would stiffly and Christianly resist the open apostate heresy which the apostate monk, Brother Martin Luther, and his disciples, preach and write' (p. 641). A similar declaration was made a few months later by the burghers of Copenhagen in return for some concessions made by their feudal lord the Bishop of Roskilde.

Doubtless when these impressive declarations were made they were made in all good faith, though perhaps with but little heart or conviction. But the irony of circumstances was too strong for all parties—alike for the clerical authorities which exacted the declarations, and for the laity which made them. In the month of May 1525, the lords assembled in their Parliament complained to the King that the primatial see of Lund was still vacant, though it was nearly three years since the execution of Slaghek, and six since the death of Birger, and there were three pretenders in the field. It appears to have occurred to no one that there was ground for spiritual uneasiness in the matter, but it was felt to be injurious to the welfare of the realm, 'inasmuch as the Archbishop of Lund is the gate and protection of the realm between the realm and Sweden, as the Duke of Slesvig is between Denmark and Germany.' The lords added a touch of impatience, not unnatural, at the way in which Rome had hindered the filling-up of this important post, and begged the King 'no longer to allow that the Holy Church in this country should be so dealt with.' It was not an inopportune moment for negotiations to be opened between Frederick and the Holy See, for Clement VII. was already at issue with the Emperor, and was more than half disposed, therefore, to accept the *de facto* sovereign of Denmark as against the *de jure* sovereign who was the Emperor's friend. The only letter which Rome addressed to Frederick I. as king, was one which accepted his nomination of George Skodborg, who had formerly been nominated by Christian II. to the see, and announced his confirmation. It seems that Clement even went so far as to consecrate the aspiring Skodborg. But the same letter from Rome contained an announcement which pleased neither the King nor his lords. It was that, in order to secure his position, Skodborg had recognised the claims of the Cardinal upon whom Leo X. six years before had conferred his 'provision.' He had, in fact, paid the Cardinal 6,000 ducats down, which he borrowed of merchants in the Netherlands, and promised him a pension of 600 ducats a year, and the right to claim the succession in case of a new vacancy. In spite,

however, of confirmation, consecration, and all the money transactions, George Skodborg was a second time disappointed of becoming Archbishop of Lund. The cautious King made no open objection, as it seems, at the time; but before Skodborg made his appearance in the kingdom, affairs had taken a new turn. Frederick had found support in other than papal directions. On August 19, 1526, Frederick published a rescript to the effect that Skodborg's position had been wrongly obtained; that, in conjunction with the Rigsraad, he confirmed the election made by the Chapter of Lund in 1519; that Aage Sparre, who had then been elected, should 'have, enjoy, use, and hold the see of Lund, with all its rights and appurtenances;' that if Skodborg chose to contest the case before the King and the Rigsraad, he was at liberty to do so; but that in case the decision should be in favour of Aage Sparre, 'then will we in no wise permit any excommunication or interdict in that behalf.' For this confirmation Aage Sparre paid 1,000 gylden into the royal treasury instead of paying it to the Pope; and from that time forward no Danish prelate ever obtained, or sought, papal confirmation.

It is true that none of the bishops of the realm, and only two other ecclesiastical lords, set their hands to this momentous declaration; but no protest was raised, either then or afterwards. Though no steps were taken, or even suggested, so far as we are aware, to have him consecrated to the episcopal office, Aage Sparre's elevation was recognised as a fact. When, in the December following, the King proposed to the meeting of the lords 'that the money which is used to be sent away to Rome for confirmation' should be applied thenceforth to the formation of a permanent treasury for the good of the realm, the bishops only answered that, 'if the King's Majesty could so arrange with propriety, the Raad of Denmark would gladly see it done.' The precedent once set was always followed during the rest of Frederick's reign. When Jens Beldenak resigned the see of Odense in 1529, Knud Gyldenstjerne, one of the two ecclesiastics who had signed the decision of the Rigsraad, took his place on the same terms. Later in the same year Joachim Rönnov succeeded Lage Urne at Roskilde; three years after, when Aage Sparre himself resigned the see of Lund, he was succeeded by Torbern Bilde; and the year after that, the old Bishop of Ribe, Iver Munk, resigned in favour of his nephew, Oluf. In each of these cases the new prelate obtained his confirmation only from the King, making at the same time promises not to

hinder the clergy, the other by long Danish Rome.

It is existing the episcopal desire to which he as a special self was involved people to which on a few re act on a from pro that the their own them a itself wa cared to events. to the P ance of to main inclined

Mean more str Frederic itself, an was bro eldest so who was already But ther any pers his time, waited t taken in intolerab pected h Albert,

hinder the preaching of the Reformation or the marriage of the clergy; in each case he was received on equal terms by the other prelates of the kingdom without any protest. Thus by long and tacit consent, if not by actual co-operation, the Danish prelates withdrew themselves from their obedience to Rome.

It is to be observed that in none of these cases did the existing bishops attempt to confer upon their new compeers the episcopal character and succession. Plainly the King had no desire to see the new bishops consecrated—a matter about which he was profoundly indifferent, regarding the prelates only as a specially troublesome kind of lords. The new men themselves were probably as little concerned, so long as the defect involved them in no loss of place or revenue. Among the people there was less and less of demand for the ministrations which only a consecrated bishop can supply; and there were a few retired and titular bishops in the kingdom who could act on an emergency. Doubtless what kept the elder prelates from proceeding to lay hands upon the new ones was the fact that they were unaccustomed to act in such matters upon their own authority. It was not even as if they had among them a consecrated archbishop to take the lead, for Lund itself was the see chiefly affected. They neither could nor cared to ask advice from Rome. They simply waited upon events. Thus while their inaction in this respect was a tribute to the Pope's authority in spiritual things, their ready acceptance of the new promotions showed that they had no desire to maintain the prerogatives for which the Pope was most inclined to wrangle.

Meanwhile the current of events was carrying the King far more strongly in the same direction. It does not seem as if Frederick had ever cared much for the question of religion in itself, and it must always remain uncertain by what steps he was brought to the position which he finally took up. His eldest son, indeed, Christian, Duke of Holstein and Slesvig, who was twenty years old when his father became king, was already a pronounced Lutheran and an enthusiastic reformer. But there is no reason to suppose that Frederick himself had any personal leanings that way. Like many other men of his time, he conformed to the religion which he found, and waited to see how things would go. The deciding step was taken in the beginning of 1526. Frederick had long felt the intolerable isolation of his position, when at last an unexpected hand was stretched out to him. It was the hand of Albert, Duke of Prussia. When, in the autumn of 1525,

Frederick had allowed his representatives to threaten the clergy of the duchies that, if they did not grant the required subsidy, the King would look favourably upon the Prussian embassy which was coming, it was well understood that the King was deciding for Lutheranism. Albert, a rising and powerful prince, was the head of the Teutonic order of knighthood, and, as such, under the vow of remaining in the single estate; but conviction or ambition had drawn him to embrace the new views, and to seek a wife and found a family, and the wife whom he selected was Frederick's daughter. 'When the cup is full,' said Frederick's messengers to the Slesvig churchmen, 'a little drop can bring it to run over.' This was the little drop. Frederick struck the covenant with Prussia, and ranged himself on the side of that religious party for favouring which his predecessor had been driven from the kingdom.

His decision once made, Frederick showed no vacillation. He ate flesh on Fridays. He allowed his officers to insist upon receiving the Sacrament in both kinds. All promises to the contrary notwithstanding, he set himself to spread abroad in his kingdom the doctrines which he hoped would break the power of his masterful peers, and win him the confidence of the people. In his desire to find a popular leader for the work of reformation, he turned, as was natural, to Paul Eliesen. If Frederick's intention had been primarily to set forward an evangelical religion, the choice could not have been better. Under the protection of Bishop Urne, Paul was busily setting forth, in the University and elsewhere, the teaching of Luther, translating his books and preaching his main theses, and making up for it by cursing Luther's name. He was still, in the eyes of the old-fashioned practitioners, the most dangerous agitator in the country. The king sent for him, under promise of immunity, to preach once more at Court on St. John the Baptist's Day, and to say plainly what he felt about Luther and Lutheranism. But Frederick had mistaken him. Paul was not to be inveigled into blessing such a reformation as Frederick desired to promote. The poor Carmelite, destined to be accused of cowardice even by the candid Dr. Helveg, was courageous enough a second time to expose himself to royal displeasure, by saying that neither Luther nor the opposition was wholly right or wholly wrong, but that there was a golden way between the two extremes. He left the palace amid hootings and outcries, and followed by the fooleries of a court jester. 'Reader Paul,' wrote a

disgust
Christ,
The
hand o
so prej
already
Origina
Johann
sent to
tenberg
which a
breache
order a
eyes of
in that
of the c
the Bish
to accou
the shap
John T
'permiss
Viborg
he was s
protect
and forc
burghers
tive of t
for them
means F
against t
the statu
burned i
just offer
wish to r
Frederick
suggestio
every se
party in
outside t
rightly h
Frederick
discipline
their plac
very reas

disgusted Lutheran to the banished King, 'is now fallen from Christ, and holds with the bishops.'

There was another vigorous man ready to Frederick's hand of a less nice and critical disposition than Paul, and not so prejudiced by knowledge, whom Frederick had probably already seen at work in Viborg, of the name of John Tausen. Originally a disciple of Paul's, and a member of the great Johannite, or Hospitaller, Priory of Antvorskov, he had been sent to complete his education at Rostock and then at Wittenberg, and had come back full of a defiant independence which asked for no sanction of authority, and scrupled at no breaches of order. He soon quitted the monastery of his order at Viborg, to which he was sent, and under the very eyes of the Bishop, George Friis, began an independent work in that city, which soon gathered round him a powerful party of the citizens. Probably some feeble attempt was made by the Bishop and his chapter to call the turbulent clergyman to account; for the next thing was a sudden thunderbolt in the shape of a 'letter of protection' from the King, in which John Tausen was named his Grace's chaplain, and received 'permission and commandment to remain for a time at Viborg and preach the Holy Gospel to the burghers,' to whom he was commended, that they, 'on the King's behalf, should protect him against all that would fall upon him with violence and force, whether they be spiritual persons or secular.' The burghers at the same time were given the privilege, irrespective of the bishop and the cathedral chapter, of maintaining for themselves 'a preacher or unattached priest.' By such means Frederick I. endeavoured to accomplish his revolution against the authorities of the Church. Perhaps no article in the statutes of Christian II., which had been so solemnly burned in this same city of Viborg, had given greater or more just offence than that which enacted that, 'if the parishioners wish to maintain for themselves a chaplain, they may do it.' Frederick I. now began to act regularly upon his predecessor's suggestion by a system of 'letters of protection' issued to every self-instituted preacher who could win to himself a party in any town. If these preachers had been altogether outside the Church, like our modern Dissenters, no one could rightly have felt aggrieved; but such an idea never entered Frederick's imagination. While free from all ecclesiastical discipline, the new preachers were to be in the Church. In their place in parliament at Odense that same year the prelates very reasonably besought the King

'that his Grace would not give anyone a letter of protection or a letter of injunction to preach in any cathedral or parish church, or in any other place openly; since it is to be feared that thence will ensue tumults among the people that are without understanding, as hath happened in divers places in Germany; but that whosoever will preach, in German or in Danish, will give the bishop to know the same in the diocese where he will preach, and then do it with his permission, only in such wise that he preach God's Word' (p. 697).

Into the question of the doctrine itself the bishops wisely did not enter; but the King took up this point in his reply, and left the other unnoticed. He had never, he said, commissioned anyone to preach anything else but God's Word and the Gospel. Before that Parliament broke up he issued a letter of protection for Sadolin, to help Tausen in his ministry at Viborg.

It was the King's son who, just over the border of Denmark proper, had first entered upon these insolent methods of procedure in the duchies. A controversy had sprung up in the spring of 1526 between the Duke and the Bishop of Ribe, in which the young man soon took occasion to tell the diocesan that he ought to provide his diocese with priests who could preach the Gospel, and who, in accordance with the Apostle's injunction, were married men. Bishop Munk answered with dignity that 'when the Holy Church throughout all Christendom adopts a different manner from that which she now uses, we also will do the same,' and added, that since he had been bishop 'the holy lessons and St. Paul's Epistles had been everywhere preached, according as holy doctors have expounded them.' The Duke had doctors at hand whose exposition he valued more highly. He summoned all the parish clergy of the district round Haderslev, where he lived—some from the diocese of Ribe, and some from that of Slesvig—to meet at periodical intervals in the town and hear the Word of God expounded by his German chaplains. When the Bishop of Ribe humbly begged him 'not to make any new fangle upon our priests and churches,' reminding him of his father's charter, and adding, 'Your Grace knows well that you must not put your sickle into another man's corn,' Christian replied by sending him a copy of his plan for a reformation, with the request that he would look whether there was anything in it which was contrary to Holy Scripture. The Bishop, who was away on high military business, only begged in return that the Duke would not put the scheme in execution until he came home. Christian did, indeed, wait, though scarcely in deference to Iver

Mun
oper
mor
A d
to a
answ
Fred
hort
they
Ana
out c
idola
depr
Duke
their
'coll
new
them
in wr
It
little
so de
submi
were t
and tr
advan
their d
so far
confess
a posit
Their
only, t
their ti
temptu
The
Odense
sion of
Ove Bi
an occ
earnest
distingu
cause fi
came, a
more pr
grievan

Munk's wishes, for two years. Then he put his plan into operation in earnest. Once more the clergy were all summoned to Haderslev, 'if they would retain their churches.' A deputation of the clergy waited upon the Bishop of Ribe to ask whether they were to comply with the summons. The answer was, that 'the Bishop could not gainsay it since King Frederick wished it so to be.' They assembled. After exhortation a new oath was administered to them, in which they swore to renounce 'the doctrines of the Sacramentarians, Anabaptists, and other such.' It was taken for granted, without oath, that 'they would give up the papistical doctrine and idolatry.' Those who declined to do so—four in number—were deprived as 'unfit for the service of the Church,' and the Duke's chaplain, himself a presbyter, ordained others to fill their places. The whole number, thereupon, received a fresh 'collation,' or institution, to their benefices, from the Duke; new 'provosts,' or rural deans, were appointed to superintend them; and finally they were all ordered to marry, or to give in writing their reasons for not doing so.

It is not to be wondered at if Catholic bishops felt but little attracted to a reformation in which their authority was so defied. The wonder is rather that they should have submitted as they did to the indignities with which they were treated. It may be that they were biding their time, and trusting that some sudden reverse would give them the advantage. It may be that they themselves were not sure of their doctrinal grounds, and feared to provoke a conflict. But, so far as their own utterances serve to guide us, it must be confessed that most of them regarded their position rather as a position of rights and emoluments than of spiritual trust. Their constant contention was to preserve—not for themselves only, to their credit be it said, but for the clergy generally—their tithes and dues; and these, though grudgingly and contemptuously, were allowed them.

The Herredag, or Parliament of the Lords, held at Odense in August 1527, is generally spoken of as the occasion of the decisive victory of Lutheranism in Denmark. Ove Bilde, with the Jylland bishops, had hoped to make it an occasion for a great victory the other way, and had earnestly sought the help of Eck, or Cochläus, or some other distinguished German divine, to maintain the conservative cause from the religious point of view; but when the time came, and no German was forthcoming, they felt it to be more prudent once more to pass lightly over their doctrinal grievances, and to dwell mainly upon the disintegration of the

forces of the country. It came at last only to this, 'that the King should hold the common people' (the nobles were free from the impost) 'to tithe every tenth sheaf of corn and head of cattle, after God's law, and after the sealed decree of King Christopher and the Rigsraad,' in return for which was made a long desired concession with regard to occasional dues—'Bishop's-gift, marriage and churching fees, *Redsel, Nannest*' (ancient technical words), 'butter-tax and burial.' The exercise of Church discipline (a matter which had brought the clergy into great odium) touched more closely upon the spiritual character, and it does the prelates credit that they made a more vigorous attempt to resist the demands of the lay nobility in this direction. Cut off as they were from Rome, they made the novel assertion that they could not with equity to others abate their claims until consultations were held with the two other Scandinavian kingdoms. But finding that their opposition was driving the nobility to side with the commons, for fear of worse, they agreed, 'as a willing service and pleasure' to the King, that 'the bishops and prelates should use their jurisdiction, as they have done hitherto, and prescribe open confession and penance, as is meet—but in such wise'—this was the point upon which the nobles felt most strongly, for an eye to lucre was not exclusively the mark of the clergy—that the Crown and the nobility and laymen take fines, and amercements for contempt, from their own tenants and servants according to the law.' This concession was to be provisional, until the next General Council of Christendom should be held. But when the churchmen, now finding themselves in a majority in the Rigsraad, petitioned the King once more 'not to allow runaway monks, who have abandoned their order and the fear of God, to obtain letters of protection or be appointed to preach, but that they may be called to account before their proper judges, and if they will not go into cloister again, may be made to leave the kingdom,' his Grace replied with a startling disclaimer of all power to compel in such matters.

'The Raad,' he said, 'is well aware that the holy Christian faith is free. As none of them would like it that any man should force and compel them from their faith, so can they well suppose that they which are inclined to the Holy Gospel, or to the Lutheran doctrine, as some call it, will not be forced from theirs neither. His Grace,' he continued, 'is king and rules over bodies and goods in the realm, but not over souls; therefore may every man so fashion himself in that matter as he will answer it before God at the last day' (p. 741).

This would be the King's pleasure 'until a final agreement

be m
to G
roya
and
hard
the l
letter
is Cl
Maje
from
was
claim
but th
to cor
that t
N
King'
respon
count
were r
at lea
the m
own p
lates—
Danish
especia
the 'd
monse
lities.
a rever
tion or
It v
trace h
preach
Certain
clergy.
found
rampar
who we
spatche
his 'ba
measur
King, i
leave th
and cha

be made in all Christendom concerning the same according to God's disposal and permission.' It was a fine and truly royal announcement if it had only been kept to afterwards, and the old faith held equally free with the new ; but it was hardly what the Rigsraad asked. The utmost promise which the King would make was that he would not indeed issue letters ; 'but in case that any of them desire to preach what is Christian and godly on their own account, the King's Majesty can well allow and permit it,' and would protect such from all violence and molestation—married men and all. It was the moment, if ever, for the prelates to put in their claim to be the judges of what was godly and Christian ; but they were not prepared to take up the challenge, and had to console themselves on the journey home with the thought that they had at least saved their tithes.

Now began, therefore, a time of violent controversy. The King's monstrous claim to send out priests who should be responsible to him alone for what they taught, filled the country with eager disputants. Braver men than the bishops were might have defied the King's encroachments, and might at least have laid formal inhibition or excommunication upon the men, warning the people not to hear them, upon their own peril. But there was no Fisher among the Danish prelates—nor, it may be added, was there a Latimer among the Danish preachers. Attempts were made, here and there, especially by Aage Sparre, the Arch-elect of Lund, to bring the 'dogmatists,' as they were called, to trial. Such summonses were treated with contempt, or avenged by hostilities. The reforming movement went on its way without a reverse, and scarcely tasted the bracing influences of humiliation or persecution.

It would be tedious and beyond our present purpose to trace here in detail the conflict between the King and his preachers on the one hand and the prelates on the other. Certainly no pains were taken to conciliate the superior clergy. At Viborg, for instance, Bishop Friis had already found himself compelled to fortify his palace with a strong rampart against the danger of assaults from the townspeople who were under the influence of Tausen. Semi-private despatches were continually passing between Frederick I. and his 'bailiff' in the place, who supported the most violent measures of the Lutheran party. In February 1529, the King, in answer to a complaint of the townspeople, gave leave that if the town could not maintain as many churches and chapels as it had, they might pull them all down except

two, the Grey Friars' and Black Friars', and use those for their parish churches, sending half the lead and bell-metal from the destroyed churches for the King's use. The Grey Friars were starved out of their home by quartering troops upon them, and it was in vain that the warden betook himself to Copenhagen to appeal to the King in person. Tausen, thereupon, taking upon himself to govern Church affairs in the city, made the Grey Friars his own church, and gave the parishioners choice among those whom he named to them, to serve the Black Friars. Their choice fell upon George Sadolin, who was not in orders. That, however, was not considered to be of much moment, and Sadolin entered upon his ministry without more orders than Tausen and the parishioners could give him. The cathedral of Viborg still stood unassailed, but three of the canons had become impressed by the Lutheran doctrine, and with their help and royal encouragement, in spite of the Bishop's remonstrances, a new-fashioned service was introduced into the choir in 1539. When one of the Bishop's own chaplains was saying Mass, Christian Stub, one of the three canons aforesaid, ran up to him, plucked the chalice out of his hands and flung it at his feet. The poor chaplain was chased out of the minster amidst the laughter of the mob, and Tausen mounted the pulpit and preached on 'Babylon the great is fallen, is fallen.' Similar scenes took place at Malmö, Copenhagen, and elsewhere.

Meanwhile the dispute was waging on the more intellectual side of the controversy as well. In the Herredag at Copenhagen in 1530, the bishops—though now sadly weakened by the death of Lage Urne—secured the help of two learned German divines, besides that of Paul Eliesen, upon whom most of them had before looked askance, and began a formal attack upon the preachers, twenty-one of whom had been summoned by the King to the Herredag. In twenty-seven articles they accused the preachers, whom they desired Frederick to keep under bail not to go away until the whole matter was decided. They ended with what Dr. Helveg well points out to have been a strategical mistake—into which they were led by Reader Paul—a declaration that 'if the papers of both parties, theirs and ours, are examined before unprejudiced judges, and their contention is found to be stronger in Scripture and reason than our apology, then will we gladly yield in all ways.' By so saying, the prelates came down from their high ground to acknowledge that the question at issue was an open question, and practically made the King and the Rigsraad judges. The

prea
man
belie
lies
retur
all t
cent
Chri
pries
else
again
again
roun
cathe
idola
set fo
them
comm
thoug
(again
allow
couns
selves
greate
them
tentio
prelat
there
minde
charter
other
self an
the mo
noisy
usages
Per
and in
the an
him in
his end
and it
would
lord.
years b
greater

preachers replied with a bitter thrust at Paul, that 'the good man who served the prelates by writing that accusation has belied us so unblushingly that he has introduced near as many lies as articles.' They themselves attacked the bishops in return at least as fiercely as they had been attacked. Besides all the oft repeated complaints which had been made for a century and more, they averred that 'they do not appoint Christian and learned parish priests;' 'that they ordain parish priests on condition and oath that they will preach nothing else than before;' 'that they raise cries and persecution against those who nevertheless preach the Gospel and contend against lies;' 'that they allow liarily strolling monks that go round about and suppress the Gospel;' 'that they in their cathedrals and monasteries cause to be held a heap of idolatrous Masses and ungodly singing;' 'that they do not set forward the work of reform, although 'they have pledged themselves thereto by the King's Majesty's agreement and command;' 'and at the same time,' so ends the category, though they will not do their own duty in that respect, 'yet (against Scripture, Church law, and honest reason) will they not allow that the people use their Christian liberty and with the counsel of Christian men call evangelical ministers for themselves; they forbid priests to marry, and thereby make the greatest part of them live in fornication; what some of themselves are we now speak nothing of.' The whole contention came to nothing. A later age may allow that the prelates received but scanty justice and no courtesy, and that there was some cause for the fierce way in which they reminded the King of the promises made in his accession charter; but at the time the general sympathies were the other way, and Frederick I. may even have considered himself an example of equity and forbearance in not yielding to the more extravagant demands of the preachers and their noisy faction, which pressed for the prohibition of the old usages altogether.

Perhaps one reason why Frederick—now a man of sixty and in feeble health—did not proceed to extremities against the ancient forms, was that his nephew was now threatening him in greater earnest than ever. Frederick, in spite of all his endeavours, had never won the confidence of the commons, and it was muttered in Copenhagen that 'if King Frederick would not defend the people, they knew where to get another lord.' And at the same time the concessions made of late years by the prelates to the lay nobility had brought about a greater unanimity between the temporal and spiritual mag-

nates, which Frederick could ill afford to affront. The danger was all the greater, inasmuch as Christian II., with an almost unparalleled hypocrisy, was now bidding for the recovery of his throne on two incompatible lines. While Mikkelsen and Pedersen, with others, were setting forth the King's evangelical zeal, and his brotherly feeling for all who shared his appreciation of the Gospel, Gustav Trolle, on the other hand—the ex-archbishop who, after sharing in the crimes of Christian, had officiated at the coronation of Frederick—was telling prelates and nobles how Christian had been reconciled to the Roman Church at Augsburg, had received solemn absolution from Cardinal Campeggio, and was now ‘come to take the power from the heretics and to upraise the Holy Church and her representatives.’ It was a time of much temptation to the Danish prelates, especially when they heard that the Norwegian Rigsraad, headed by the Archbishop of Trondheim, had renounced allegiance to Frederick and done homage to Christian. But much as they had now learned to hate Frederick, the prelates had not unlearned their fear of his predecessor. The fleet which went out to encounter him in Norway was commanded by Knud Gyldenstjerne, the un-consecrated Bishop of Odense. Knud brought him under safe-conduct to Denmark.

‘We come now to you, dear lord and brother,’ wrote the poor wretch to his uncle, ‘like the Prodigal Son, not only as to our uncle, but as to one who is now our regenerate brother and fellow-member in Jesus Christ; and we hope continually in God that you will regard with benevolence and compassion our great misery, which we to this day have suffered, which forced and compelled us to this business, and not desire for revenge and wrath against our adversaries’ (p. 907).

In spite of his unctuous phrases, however—and in spite of his safe-conduct—the unhappy prince found his way to the dungeon of Sönderborg Castle, where for seventeen years he lived in a captivity whose solitude was only broken by the company of a half-witted dwarf. At the end of that time he was removed to a less uncomfortable prison, and passed the remaining ten years of his life in comparative ease. His uncle, Frederick I., did not long enjoy the advantages which were gained by his breach of faith. It was on July 30, 1532, that Christian was conveyed to Sönderborg; on the following Maundy Thursday, April 10, 1533, Frederick I. expired.

III. King Frederick's death left the kingdom for three years in a state of confusion and civil war. Much as he had wished to arrange for the succession to the throne, he had

new
the c
nobl
but t
tian
upon
old, v
As an
1533.
twelv
part o
local
and c
Crown
unspe
month
into s
and, u
Christ
Danish
the ost
king of
haved
Danish
Denma
the Lü
the no
from th
him an
their ex
duchies
cuted th
promote
with the
back in
of their
Christop
Papist, I
to the th
venient
One disa
Fyen, th
Gustav T
Governor
ended h
VOL. X

never been able to get the nobles to promise more than that the choice should fall upon one or other of his sons. The lay nobles would have been willing to elect the eldest, Christian ; but the spiritual members of the Rigsraad knew young Christian too well to consent. It was their wish to place the crown upon the head of his half-brother John, a child of twelve years old, whom they hoped to be able to educate in Church ways. As an agreement proved to be impossible in the summer of 1533, the Rigsraad determined to postpone the election for a twelvemonth. So completely had Denmark, during the latter part of Frederick's reign, been broken up into a number of local governments under the great landowners ecclesiastical and civil, that there was not much visible difference when the Crown was thus put into commission. But the delay brought unspeakable miseries in its consequence. Before the twelvemonth was accomplished the democracy of Lübeck entered into secret treaty with the towns of Copenhagen and Malmö, and, under the experienced lead of the adventurer Count Christopher of Oldenburg, a civil war broke out—known in Danish history as the *Grevefeide*, or Count's War—of which the ostensible object was to make the captive Christian II. king once more. The young Duke Christian meanwhile behaved with great sagacity. He made no claim upon the Danish Crown, but he obtained a treaty of union between Denmark and the duchies, and with a strong hand he drove the Lübeckers out of Holsteen. By the beginning of July the nobles of Jylland, his nearest neighbours, the furthest from the seat of war, found that they could not do without him and elected him their king. The nobles of Fyen followed their example. Lübeck was forced to make peace with the duchies so as to get rid of battle at its gates, though it prosecuted the war elsewhere. A popular rising in North Jylland, promoted by Count Christopher, was brilliantly quelled ; and, with the help of the Swedes, the Count's party was driven back in the province of Skaane. Provoked by the ill-success of their cause, the Lübeckers endeavoured to supersede Count Christopher by Albert of Mecklenburg, who, being a zealous Papist, had first hoped, through Ove Bilde, to obtain election to the throne from the Church party, but now found it convenient to embrace the Gospel to come in by another way. One disaster followed another. On the field of Öxnebjerg, in Fyen, the democratic party suffered a great defeat, in which Gustav Trolle, who had been made Bishop of Odense and Governor of Fyen by that party, received a wound which ended his turbulent career. Castle after castle surrendered

to the nobles, and on August 6, 1536, King Christian III. and his Queen Dorothy entered in state into Copenhagen.

If the Danish bishops had known at the outset what distress they would bring upon their country by refusing to elect Christian on the death of his father, they would have been much to blame in doing so. And yet their action was not destitute of a kind of honourableness. Had they been men who cared only for the wealth belonging to their sees, they might have acquiesced in the election, for Christian's conduct had always been in accordance with the words which he wrote to Philip of Hesse shortly after his father's death: 'that he would gladly allow the prelates to keep their incomes and revenues for their lifetime, because it was not the money that he sought; but that he would rather take foot in hand (that is, "be off") and let everything lie, than he would suffer the papistical unchristian system.' It was in defence of what they had learned to call by a better name that the bishops had stood out for the hope of obtaining a Catholic king; and they were within their constitutional rights in so doing.

Nor can it be said that these men—or all of them, at least—were either bigoted opponents of new religious light or traitors to the liberties of their country for the sake of the Pope. Among the older prelates, indeed, who still held on—George Friis, of Viborg, and Styge Krumpen, of Börglum, to whom perhaps may be added Gottschalk Ahlefeldt, of Slesvig—there was no intellectual or spiritual sympathy with the new movement; but there was, on the other hand, no pronounced antipathy. It was the practical violence of the reforming party and the sense of personal grievance which moved them to adopt that policy of passive obstruction which they pursued. But it was otherwise with the man who, after the death of his friend Lage Urne, took the leading place among the Danish bishops. Ove Bilde, of Aarhus, though not free from the vice of greed, was a man of culture and learning, and appears all through to have stood by the champion of Catholic reform, Paul Eliesen, whose last contribution to the controversies of the time came out during the Count's War. It was *A Christian Reconciliation and Accord, in view of the Unchristian Strife and Variance which hath now in our time broken the Unanimous Communion of the General Christian Church*. While defending in this work the old customs, Paul was willing to allow of Mass in the vernacular, communion in both kinds, marriage of priests, and other things, which, if they had been granted earlier, might have changed the whole tone of the Reformation. There is no sign that Ove Bilde at

any time disapproved of such a policy ; and it is pathetic to observe that in his old age, some years after the accession of Christian III., when it was plain that no opposition could mend matters and that the new order was firmly and finally settled in, amid the somewhat offensive pæans of the Lutheran preachers, the deposed Bishop thought well to make the best of what he found, and went with all his household to receive the communion at the hands of his parish minister.

Two of the younger men, who had been elected to their sees after communication with Rome had ceased, had gone further still. Knud Gyldenstjerne, of Odense—chosen by Jens Andersen to be his successor, at the King's suggestion and with his chapter's consent—not only took his oath to refrain from seeking confirmation from Rome, but actively aided the work of doctrinal reformation in his diocese by measures which cannot but excite surprise. In the spring of 1532 he summoned Sadolin, Tausen's brother-in-law and friend, who had received no episcopal ordination, to be, as Sadolin called it, 'his fellow-helper in the Word.' Gyldenstjerne had been Dean of Viborg, and therefore well knew his man ; and though probably not himself a religious person one way or the other, he appears to have put the diocese more or less under Sadolin's charge when he sailed with his fleet to Norway. In his absence, but under his name, Sadolin called a synod of the diocesan clergy and promulgated to them as the Synodal Statutes Luther's Little Catechism, long known in Denmark under the title of Knud Gyldenstjerne's Catechism, requiring every parish priest to be guided by it in his teaching. At the same time he put forth in Danish the Confession of Augsburg (without naming it) as a set of articles in which, he said, the Bishop would examine his clergy at his next visitation. The Vicar-General of Odense so strongly disapproved of this teaching that Sadolin was forced to leave Fyen for a time, and found refuge, strangely enough, with old Jens Andersen, who was living in retirement at Taasinge. That veteran, shortly before his resignation, had evinced a religious interest, unseen in him before, by a spirited controversy with John Tausen ; but perhaps he was now the more inclined to take the popular side in revenge for the treatment which he had received from the arrogance of the Rigsraad, which some years before had condemned the hated plebeian to pay a heavy sum of money to a noble family in his diocese, and after his resignation branded him with the opprobrious titles of *Mindremand*, *Tremarksmand*, which carried with them the loss of all civil rights. Knud Gyldenstjerne, on returning

from his cruise, amused himself by setting his Vicar-General and his 'fellow-helper in the Word' to dispute in his presence, and expressed himself wholly in favour of Sadolin, thus winning for himself the highest praise from the Lutheran preachers throughout the kingdom.

James, or Joachim, Rönnov, elected to the rich and powerful see of Roskilde on the death of Bishop Urne, was probably a layman at the time of his election, from the fact that he was engaged to be married to a daughter of the most powerful and zealous of the Lutheran nobles; though, if he was a priest, this circumstance may have inclined King Frederick to nominate him.¹ Rönnov on his election took the oath

'that if any man come anywhere in Roskilde diocese, either in towns or in villages, that will preach and teach the Holy Gospel and God's Word pure and plain, as they shall prove the same by Holy Scripture, and if priests or monks there in the diocese will marry and take them wives, then will I not allow that they be set upon with violence or injury in anywise, so far as I can help it; and whoso will find fault with them therefore shall come before the King and the Rigsraad, and there stand trial' (p. 811).

That Rönnov was a man not opposed to reforms, although he was hardly prepared to go as far as Gyldenstjerne, and had a sharp tongue and a heavy hand for a preacher when he got a chance, is proved by the proposals which he made to Frederick in 1530 with a view to reintroducing order into the town of Copenhagen. Expressly recognizing the promise made at his appointment, he offers 'with all honesty to reform what fault and breach can be found with the clergy in his diocese,' and even joins the preachers in begging the King 'to consent to make a final order and reformation in the matter of the Church which shall hold until the Diet in Augsburg is over.' 'That false, heretical bishop,' a passionate adherent of the old system calls him; while a letter to him from King Gustav of Sweden is preserved in which he rejoices that 'the grace of God has visited his heart so that he will abide by the Gospel.'

When we consider what confusion had been brought into the Danish Church by the high-handed way in which Frederick I. had acted, it cannot but seem natural and right that on his death the prelates should have seen their opportunity and endeavoured to restore a measure of discipline. It was hopeless to think of putting the Reformation down

¹ He never was consecrated, but employed as his suffragan a Dutch Franciscan called Vincent, who bore the title of Bishop of Greenland. Vincent had been confessor to the mother of Christian II., and seems to have performed episcopal functions in other dioceses also.

altogether, even if it were wished ; but things might be partly restored. At the Herredag in which it was determined to defer the election of a king, the Raad agreed

'that every bishop shall in his diocese have sole authority to institute priests and preachers who shall maintain Masses and divine service after Christian fashion, and teach their parishioners to live according to the Holy Gospel ; and none of the nobility, townsfolk, or commons shall take to themselves any curate or preacher. If any shall presume to appoint any curate or preacher otherwise than with the bishop's approval and consent, he shall be prosecuted at the assizes, and punished for breach of peace' (p. 952).

At the same time the bishops were willing to agree that 'if any curate be refractory and ill-disposed, then shall the people give the bishop to know it, and he shall then be bound to appoint them another that is well qualified and can teach them God's Word and their souls' salvation.' Other useful and moderate measures were agreed upon at the same time. It is considered that the whole 'Reces,' or settlement, was the work of Joachim Rönnov.

Perhaps it would have made for peace if the lords had stopped here ; but they boldly proceeded to give a sample of what their settlement meant by summoning before them the redoubtable John Tausen, who now for several years had been the idol of Copenhagen, as formerly of Viborg. The mob affected to believe that he was to be put on trial for his life, and assembled under arms outside the Raadhuus. They were assured that neither his life nor even his doctrine was called in question, only his relation to superior authority ; but the uproar grew more and more fierce. In the midst of the storm John Tausen was condemned, or ordered, to quit Sjælland and Skaane after a month's respite, and never again to write a book, preach, or execute any ministerial office without the permission of the diocesan. The fury of the populace was extreme. 'Had one hair of his head been touched,' writes an eye-witness of the scene, 'not one of the members of the Rigsraad would have come away alive.' More than all, their liege lord, Rönnov, excited the people's displeasure, and it is said that only Tausen's interposition brought him to his palace with a whole skin. Tausen, however, was wise enough to see that the terms which were offered him were not altogether bad. On that day month he came to the Elect of Roskilde, accompanied by Mogens Gjöö, the father of Rönnov's betrothed, and with Gjöö's help the two masterful men made it up. Tausen promised that he would 'speak no more abusive words against bishops and prelates, canons and priests,' that he would be

'submissive, loyal, and obedient to the bishop,' and that he would 'forward to the utmost of his power his good and the good of the clergy.' For the keeping of this promise Gjö made himself surety, saying that he would 'venture neck, life, and property' upon it. Thereupon the Elect waived that part of the sentence which required Tausen to go away, and gave him leave to remain and preach. The victory, however, remained with Rönnov, and from that day Tausen's influence in Copenhagen sensibly declined.

The next step which the bishops thought of taking was to reopen communications with headquarters in Italy. But here lay in the way 'that little stone,' as Helveg calls it, of the 'provisions' which Rome had made. Neither the original favourite of Leo X., nor Johan Veze, the German agent for whom Christian II. had obtained promises both of Lund and of Roskilde, was willing to abandon his claims. That most unfortunate of men, Clement VII., durst not resist the whole imperial house, now reconciled to him, whom Veze succeeded in interesting on his behalf. Rome haggled and delayed. The Danish bishops assembled at Roskilde in September 1533 wrote indignantly to the College of Cardinals :—

'It is highly to be feared that many churches in the world will fall from obedience to the Pope, partly because of unaccustomed provision upon certain churches, partly because of unseasonable bestowals of certain dignities; in this way all rights, as well public as private, are outraged, without gain to any man, either to the Pope or any other—not even to the elect himself, seeing that he is not elected lawfully and canonically. If indeed it is your wish that religion, that your own honour and good estate, be protected, then do what you can with your counsel to spare the world the open scandal of these provisions, which now have already torn many away from connexion with the Roman Church, and which will tear more away in a short time if wise rules of behaviour are not soon adopted' (p. 964).

It was perhaps too late for Rome to recover Denmark wholly to her allegiance, but if she had yielded to these remonstrances she might at least have graced her expulsion from the realm by a few martyrdoms and some spiritual splendour. But, so far as is known, no answer came from the cardinals. The Pope clung to his provision, and the Danish prelates were left to themselves.

All this took place before the outbreak of the civil war. It was the first common object of the assailants to break the power of the nobles, and especially of the prelates, although each member of the confederacy had naturally his own private interests to serve besides. The prelates were therefore ranged

that he
and the
made
ife, and
part of
d gave
ever, re-
fluence

g was to
But here
, of the
original
gent for
und and
at most
ne whole
succeeded
delayed.
ber 1533

d will fall
med pro-
bestowals
as private,
e or any
ot elected
igion, that
what you
al of these
connexion
in a short
(64).

wholly to
nstances
the realm
But, so
als. The
were left

civil war.
break the
although
n private
re ranged

upon the same side as Duke Christian. Only one of them, Joachim Rönnov, did homage to Count Christopher as the representative of Christian II., and he only under compulsion. At first he resigned his see, and then, at the instance of the chapter of Roskilde, resumed it on payment of a large sum of money to the Count. At one moment Styge Krumpen of Börglum entered into negotiations with the Count; but Rönnov himself betrayed them. All the others, though it must have been with a heavy heart, accepted the Duke of Slesvig. From the religious or doctrinal point of view there was nothing to choose between Christian II. and Christian III., and Christian III. was at least the champion of the aristocratic party as against George Woollenweaver, George Cook, Ambrose Bookbinder, and all their associates. No third course was any longer open, and Christian III. received the homage of the Jylland nobles, bishops and all, under promise that 'no man shall force or compel any who will keep to the old usages and ceremonies; neither shall those be forbidden who will hold the new order; everyone may so order himself in the faith as he will answer it before God.' All ecclesiastical property should remain in the hands of its owners 'until we ourselves come into a peaceful government.'

It was not easy to guess from this promise what would be the first act of that peaceful government which the bishops now joined to establish. On August 6, 1536, as has been said already, Christian III. entered into Copenhagen. On the 11th Christian announced to a gathering of his commanders that the bishops would give nothing for the payment of the troops, although the Bishop of Aarhus, at least, had given all the silver of his table and more besides. The conclusion was that they 'in God's name should pinion the bishops.' At four o'clock next morning the Elects of Lund, Roskilde, and Ribe were brought as prisoners into the castle. At eight the king assembled a Rigsraad—for many of the nobles had attended his entry into the town—told them what had happened, and 'compelled them to give their approval of what he had concerted with his men of war.' It is one of those men of war who gives the account in a letter written the same day. Posts went out that morning to two men in Fyen to apprehend Knud Gyldenstjerne, who had been the first of the prelates to accept Christian III., and to two men in Jylland to apprehend the Bishops of Börglum and Viborg, as well as the retired bishop of Ribe, Christian's old antagonist in controversy, Iver Munk. All castles and manors belonging to the bishops were to be seized. Only one Danish bishop

remained for a few days at liberty. Ove Bilde of Aarhuus was at the Rigsraad of August 12, nor is he known to have protested; but when he was required to surrender his castles and manors he refused, and sheltered himself under the oath which he had taken on appointment to his office. So Ove Bilde, too, found himself a prisoner, though the King declared 'that he would not take a halfpenny from him, but would let him keep all his revenues.' Perhaps because Slesvig was not in the kingdom proper—perhaps also because the Reformation had long been practically carried through in that duchy—Godske Ahlefeld was not touched; but he was the only bishop or bishop-elect of the province who was not under arrest.

The Rigsraad of August 12 was composed of eleven men, among whom, besides the Bishop of Aarhuus, were Mogens Gjøl and Tyge Krabbe, the two most powerful of the lay nobles—the first an ardent Lutheran, the other an ardent opponent. This assembly bound itself by a solemn declaration that the members 'would never after that day give their help, nor in any manner scheme, either privily or openly, for any bishop, either those that now live or any other bishops, to come to temporal or spiritual government in the kingdom of Denmark, before it so happen that there be holden and approved an universal *Generale Concilium* in Christendom' (p. 1021). Ove Bilde did not sign the declaration; but it was signed by all the rest. The town councils were summoned from the chief towns in the kingdom, and put their hands to the same. A Parliament held in the following October repeated the resolution. There the various classes of the community fell upon one another's necks, and made friends over the prostrate prelates. 'God,' they said, 'has allowed His heavy wrath and chastisement to go over us, that we, the whole commons and people, have lifted and set ourselves up against our betters, and that we, the Rigsraad and the nobility, have in turn stirred ourselves against the commons and people.' But now, 'first will we, King Christian, the Rigsraad, and nobility, that all hate and envy we in anywise may have had against townsfolk and peasantry—and in like manner will we, townsfolk and peasantry, that everything which we in anywise may have had against the King's Majesty, the Rigsraad, and nobility—shall on all sides be made up and brought into accord; so that we hereafter will build and bide together, and one with the other protect and maintain this kingdom.' The blame for all the late misfortunes of the country was cast upon the wicked ecclesiastics who had hindered the King's

election. 'Those bishops,' continued the fraternal manifesto, 'who for the sake of their misdoings were deposed, shall never come again to their episcopal governments, sees, or the possessions of their sees, nor any others like them; but instead shall be made other Christianlike bishops or superintendents, that can teach and preach the Holy Gospel and God's Word and the holy Christian faith' (p. 1025).

So fell the ancient episcopate of Denmark, unpitied and unreverenced. Yet there were some things in which they might have expected both reverence and pity. Too patriotic to submit to papal encroachments on the one hand, too catholic-minded to go with the excesses of reform on the other, they earned the scornful remark of Christian III., that they were 'neither papist nor evangelical.' The taunt might well be considered an encomium, were it not that, all along, interest dictated their action at least as much as conviction. It is true that they were never fairly dealt with, that they were reckoned as enemies throughout, that they were never invited to co-operate in the regeneration of their Church, that their most sacred rights and duties were invaded in the most offensive manner possible. But it is true that the bishops of 1536 were nobles first and bishops after—nobles by birth and prejudice as well as by position. They probably had no intention to neglect the spiritual side of their office, yet they did not understand it, and (like their relatives, both alive and dead) regarded the office as a prize, lucrative and dignified; and their whole policy was distorted by the misconception. Men to whom the religious interest was supreme would either have gone out to meet the reforming movement, and brought it into ways of sobriety, or would have sacrificed all in combating it. But it is easier to point out the way in which great opportunities are lost than to take them when they are offered.

Rönnov was the only one of the prelates who never came out of his captivity. He died in 1544, after his place of confinement had been often changed, in Copenhagen Castle, a hated prisoner still. Ove Bilde, as well as his namesake of Lund, and Gyldenstjerne of Odense, was set free within twelve months, on promise of not attempting to regain his office or to combat the new ecclesiastical *régime*. As has been said already, he at last went so far as to conform to that *régime*, and when he was buried among his forefathers in the Priory of Antvorskov, Christian III. followed him to the grave. The others were kept some little while longer under restraint, but were released on the same conditions, and re-

ceived, as did those already named, some secularized monastery or other fragment of the Church property to console themselves with. In the case of Oluf Munk, the young Elect of Ribe, was added the curious condition that he should enter the married state, with which he complied. Knud Gyldenstjerne, without compulsion, did the same.

There was no one of sufficiently commanding personality among the native preachers for Christian III. to entrust with the work of introducing his new order. He turned to 'the worthy Father, Dr. Martin Luther, by whom God, in His loving kindness and compassion, has sent us the holy Gospel.' Luther, though a partisan of Christian's imprisoned cousin, had already written to the King to express his delight at the 'extirpation of the bishops, because they would not cease to persecute God's Word and to confound the temporal government.' He now sent Bugenhagen (since Melancthon could not be spared) to be the apostle of the new Church. Bugenhagen arrived at Copenhagen in July 1537. To betoken the King's sense of the greatness of this legation *a latere*, Bugenhagen was invited to take the place of the old archbishops of Lund, and to perform the coronation of Christian and his Queen. A few days later, though only a presbyter himself, he solemnly consecrated to their office the seven new superintendents, or bishops, as the people persisted in calling them. Some of these men had themselves undertaken before to make presbyters of others; now they were raised to their novel episcopate by one of their own order, whose only claim to be above them was that he came from Wittenberg and was appointed to do it by the King.

From that unhappy ordination is derived the authority of all the present Danish ministers. It was not, on the one hand, a case in which no true episcopal consecration could be had; in all probability a very slight pressure would have brought the older bishops to consecrate Gyldenstjerne, Rönö, and others who might have carried the ancient succession on. Nor was it, on the other hand, a case of deliberate preference for presbyterian ordination, as in some countries; the men now set apart—or almost all of them—were already presbyters, and they were to be made something more, and for the future to have sole authority to ordain. The act was intended distinctly to mark a new beginning—new like the 'Gospel' which accompanied it.

There have not been wanting men in the later Danish Church who, in the revival of the study of antiquity, have felt the defects of their ecclesiastical polity, and have desired to

remedy them. This was for a time the case with Grundtvig, the man who more than any other in this century awoke in the hearts of his countrymen a new love for the historic faith ; and his knowledge of England led him to hope that the help might come from us. It is well known that the present esteemed 'Bishop' in Iceland, on his appointment to that office, besought the King to allow him to seek consecration from the English bishops ; but Martensen, the author of the *Dogmatics* and *Ethics* so deservedly popular among us, vehemently opposed the design, which he regarded as a step towards 'Catholicism,' and likely to hinder his favourite scheme of a fusion between Lutheranism and the 'Reformed.' Perhaps, also, as Primate of the Danish Church, Martensen shrank from the humiliation which seemed to be involved ; and, being an imperious man and all powerful at Court, he succeeded in crushing the project, which in the consecration sermon he unsparingly denounced. But a more Catholic-minded school is making its way in the country, with a deeper value for the lessons of history, foremost among whom may be named Dr. Frederick Nielsen, the erudite and able Professor of Ecclesiastical History in the University of Copenhagen. Though he has never visited our country, he is acquainted with every phase of our modern movements, and reads more English theological works than many English priests find time to read. Professor Nielsen makes no secret of his desire for a closer relation between his Church and ours, or of his willingness to see such reforms effected in his own Church as would make it possible for the English bishops to confer the succession upon occupants of Danish sees. What reforms, doctrinal and practical, would be necessary as an antecedent condition need not here be discussed ; but if ever the isolation of the English Church is to be broken down, and communion to be established between her and any national Church abroad, there is no quarter to which she might more hopefully look than to the Scandinavian Churches. No other nation is so near to our own in temperament as the Danish ; no other Church so near in practical feeling and modes of thought. The readers of this Review may well be asked to pray for the opening of a way by which, without compromising any principle which we rightly prize, the English Church might communicate from the fulness of her inheritance to a noble and zealous society of Christians which has in some ways been not equally blessed.

ART. IX.—THE MARIAN PERSECUTION.

History of the Church of England from the Abolition of the Roman Jurisdiction. By RICHARD WATSON DIXON, M.A., Vicar of Warkworth, Hon. Canon of Carlisle. Vol. IV. Mary—A.D. 1553–1558. (London, 1891.)

CANON DIXON has devoted a volume of 737 pages to the narration of the history of the Church during the reign of Mary. This amount of space may seem excessive, but the period is one of such exceptional interest, and the mass of materials to be handled is so vast, that we are not able to say that it has been treated at too great length. On the contrary, we hold that the feeling of the readers of this volume will be one of thankfulness and gratitude to the industrious writer who has brought together so large a portion of most interesting matter, and who has, upon the whole, set it forth with lucidity and intelligence. No doubt there are some faults of arrangement, and exceptions may here and there be taken to the style in which the narrative is related, and to the use of barbarous Latinized words; but these minor blemishes are completely obscured by the real value of the work, and by the excellent spirit of candour and fairness which pervades it. Many will hold it to be a fault that Canon Dixon is too calm and dispassionate in the face of the horrible scenes of fanaticism and cruelty which he has to relate, but the business of the historian is to state facts clearly and fully, rather than to enlarge upon their character and to excite passion by the recital. Neither is it fitting, even when one is most inclined to write strongly, to neglect to take into account opposite views, or to shut the eyes to mitigating circumstances or elements of doubtfulness as regards the exact truth of a narration. Others will quarrel with the book for not being sufficiently sceptical, for giving credit to received and generally admitted opinions; for allowing any amount of weight to that which the world in general has agreed to believe and honour. Strange to say, this is distinctly the case with many modern histories. The writers appear never to be satisfied unless they are overturning, or trying to overturn, all previous conceptions. History with them is nothing if not new. A few ill-digested records, many of which are valueless, are held sufficient to upset all previous theories, and the pride of the writer is flattered by the self-satisfied notion that he at last has set the world

right. Now, in Canon Dixon's volume we can find nothing of this. If he is judicially calm he is certainly not inordinately sceptical. He is courageous enough to use John Foxe, Strype, and Burnet, without insinuating that because these writers have made a statement it must of necessity be suspicious. He gives the writers on both sides in these troubled times a fair and impartial hearing; and his large acquaintance with collateral authorities, and the exhaustive search which he has made among the records and the rare books belonging to the period, make his judgment most valuable. The scope and character of the work, and the ruling idea in the mind of the historian, had best be described in his own words.

'I have exhibited the great struggle of this reign from an Anglican aspect, and represented it as a battle between two books. This view, apparent in the narratives of the confessors and martyrs, has been kept out of sight not only by the general historians, who were perhaps little likely to preserve or present it, but by the ecclesiastical historians also, whose intelligence in the subject might be expected to be keener; so that, in the three centuries that have elapsed since the historian of the persecution made his collections, there is not a writer who has cared to declare with any stress that the English martyrs died in defence of the English Prayer Book. The doctrinal subject of contention, the Sacramental controversy, has overshadowed all others, and if any of the historians makes mention of the issue, on which the whole contest depended, whether the English or the Latin service should prevail, it is in a cursory and unimpressive manner' (p. 732).

The assertion here made will probably be found to need some qualification. Many of the martyrs, no doubt, were fully prepared to contend for the English Prayer Book; others, like Hooper and the Frankfort exiles, desired a 'further reformation.' We are very well content, however, to take Canon Dixon's view, as applying in the main to the body of Reformers persecuted to the death in this murderous reign. They took their stand upon the laws of the land. So confident were they of the legality of their position that at the beginning of Mary's reign they actually attempted to prosecute those who set up the Latin Mass; and 'a judge, who charged the jury, as he was bound to do, to find according to the existing laws, is said to have been rebuked by the Lord Chancellor because he had not rather paid regard to the Queen's intentions, indicated in her proceedings' (p. 25). Canon Dixon is somewhat amusingly at a loss how to designate the two parties which were then striving together within the Church of England. He has invented the singular

word 'Romanensian' for the party of the adherents of the Pope. On the other hand, he does not like to call the Reformers Protestants, because that is a word of foreign origin; or Gospellers, because that seems contemptuous. As he has so well shown that the cause for which these men suffered was in truth the cause of Catholic truth, he need not, we think, have hesitated to call them Catholics.

The circumstances under which the reign of Mary began were especially unfortunate and ominous of ill for the Church of England. The senseless scheme of Northumberland served to embitter a temper which had been sufficiently embittered before by the slights which she had had to endure in her brother's reign. Many of the Church dignitaries had lent themselves to the attempt to bar her accession to the throne, and in particular Cranmer had added this to the many previous grounds of hatred which had existed in her mind against him. Canon Dixon does not hesitate to fix the crime of the persecution which soon followed almost entirely upon the Queen, and he makes somewhat of an attempt to exculpate Philip from any active share in it, accepting, apparently, the famous sermon of Alphonso da Castro as a genuine sentiment in favour of toleration, instead of a cunning attempt to throw the odium upon the English bishops. This position seems a difficult one to maintain in the face of the facts which Canon Dixon duly notes. 'Philip was, it is true, cruel enough. In his other realms he afterwards enjoyed acts of faith of a far more exquisite atrocity than the plain English burnings, with their roaring and cheering mobs' (p. 340). 'Alphonso the preacher was, it is true, himself the author of a treatise on the punishment of heretics' (p. 342), which, if not written now, was certainly published not long afterwards, and is somewhat of a strange comment on his plea for moderation. That Mary, who idolized Philip, and accepted every suggestion of his with the deepest deference, should have differed from him on so important a matter as the punishment of the Reformers, and should have ventured to act independently of his opinion and in opposition to his views, seems plainly opposed to common sense. We must allow the cold-blooded Spaniard a full share in the direful tragedies, and not load the unhappy Queen with all the odium. For Canon Dixon—very rightly, we think—is anxious to exonerate the English bishops, and though he has a hard task in the matter of Bonner, yet even him he will not altogether abandon. While he does not shrink from exposing his brutal

behav
volun
as far

discer
He w
to be
feigne
venier
evasio
unkin
stories
tions,
and bo

Br
Canon
Gardi
He ha
access
opinio
having
diner
persec
suppos
would
Reform
might
by his
secutin
Norwic
sive fe
'seems
Bonner
the for
person
Canter
secutio
especia
Suffolk
Northu
men th
change
We can
which h

behaviour (of which more anon), yet at the conclusion of the volume he returns gallantly to the task of exonerating him as far as may be.

'The character of Bonner, stained by obloquy, will have been discerned by the reader not to have been the worst that could be. He was a man of resolution, who, having undertaken what he held to be a duty, neither shrunk from executing it, like some, nor feigned to execute it, like others. He avoided no personal inconvenience in discharging it: and although he would not allow of evasion or subterfuge, yet otherwise he showed himself not only not unkind, but long-suffering, considerate, and generous . . . Of the stories of his atrocity some have been seen to rest on weak foundations, but others remain as yet without extenuation. . . . In language and behaviour Bonner seems to have been an oddity' (p. 709).

But, if somewhat unduly tender towards this 'oddity,' Canon Dixon is, we think, a little too severe on Gardiner. Gardiner was a mere politician, a character of no real weight. He had written to order in Henry VIII.'s time, and on the accession of Mary he was prepared to throw over his former opinions, and to manipulate matters for his own advantage, having an eye specially to the see of Canterbury. But Gardiner was certainly opposed to anything like wholesale persecution. He judged other men by his own standard, and supposed that the punishment of a few of the ringleaders would at once intimidate and convert the whole body of the Reformers. Finding himself mistaken, he retired as much as might be from the hideous work of slaughter, and was spared by his death from witnessing the worst excesses of the persecuting spirit. Of the other bishops, Hopton, Bishop of Norwich, seems to have been the solitary example of excessive ferocity. 'The historian of martyrs,' says Canon Dixon, 'seems to prefer him and his chancellor, Dunning, before Bonner himself for want of mercy' (p. 403). This man was the former confessor of the Queen, and in his diocese 46 persons perished at the stake, a number only exceeded by Canterbury (55) and London (128). Now, that such a persecution should have fallen upon the eastern counties was especially unfortunate for the character of Mary. When Suffolk and Norfolk rallied around her so readily during the Northumberland rebellion, the Queen had assured the Suffolk men that she did not intend to compel her subjects to any change of religion.¹ This was how she kept her promise. We cannot, indeed, attempt to relieve Mary of the burden which history lays upon her, though we believe she was sup-

¹ Dodd, *Church History*, ii. 55 note.

ported by the approval and counsel of her husband. Canon Dixon's estimate of her policy is very just.

'The public conscience was shocked by these repeated horrors; and, at the same time, the public intelligence could discern nothing of awe or majesty in the authors of them. A woman sat on the throne, which was shared by a foreigner; a factious Council wrangled over letters and orders which half of them detested; a lord chancellor was publicly baffled in argument by men over whom he had the power of life and death . . . a bench full of intruded bishops contained only one who seemed to be in earnest; of whom the efforts merely availed to cover himself with obloquy. Above all, the purity of the Queen's intentions was against her. Extending heretical pravity to the most incredible stretch, she endangered all classes: and she meant that none should escape for what she deemed deadly and pestiferous error. . . . The attempt made by the powers of the realm to treat as heretics the whole nation, so far as the whole nation should hold to the religion which it had received a few years ago from the powers of the realm, was new in persecution' (p. 356).

It seems, then, that to this unhappy queen must be assigned a singular glory. Not only was she a persecutor of excessive rigour, but she was a persecutor of a new type.

We propose now, without entering on the details of the sufferings of the martyrs, which are too harrowing for contemplation when not absolutely necessary, to note some points of the Marian persecution which seem especially to deserve notice as illustrating its character. In the first place we are struck by the utter illegality of its earlier stages. Having declared in Council on August 12 that 'she meant not to compel or strain the conscience of others otherwise than by persuasion,' on pretence of a trifling disturbance at St. Paul's, Mary issued, by virtue of her supremacy, a general prohibition of all preaching, and thus intimated that 'persuasion would not be always the only means she would employ.' Some, however, having had a licence in the former reign, continued to preach. They were arrested, and immediately the gaols began to fill. The English service was not yet illegal, but attempts were at once made to introduce the Latin Mass in many churches, and where these attempts were resisted by the parson he quickly found himself in prison. This illegal introduction was described as the 'Queen's proceedings,' and the Council went so far as, by an 'enormous stretch' (p. 21), to order the punishment of any who spoke against these 'proceedings.' Acting as autocratically as ever her father did in the height of his power, Mary proceeded to wield her supremacy for the reordering of the Church according to her own fancy, so that even the Romish theo-

logia
who
where
years
the c
shoul
there
punish
Henry
the re
but th
of the
imprac
ticable
tells u
been b
'nothin
a rotten
being v
house,
house in
During
help, b
sufferer
till Dec
first ye
clerical,
married
illegal s
the state
'The
to the sto
professor
seas. Th
by the Re
in prison,
schism w
movement
calamities
seen to h
out weil u
thereof re

The
these sad
the 'Rom
VOL. X

logians were scandalized (p. 26). A great number of those who were afterwards martyred were now thrown into prison, where they remained without trial for eighteen months or two years; miserably treated in many cases, without knowing the charge made against them, being reserved until the laws should be fitted for their final destruction. For at this moment there was no statute law in existence which enacted capital punishment for heresy. The Lollard laws had been repealed by Henry's Six-Article Law, and that again had been repealed in the reign of Edward. The bishops might commit for heresy, but they could not hand over the victim to the tender mercies of the sheriff. But, though capital punishment was as yet impracticable, detention in the misery of prisons was practicable, and was abundantly carried out. Bishop Hooper tells us what his treatment in these horrible dungeons had been before he was brought to his trial. He had

'nothing appointed to him for his bed but a little pad of straw, and a rotten covering with a tick and a few feathers therein, the chamber being vile and stinking, on the one side the sink and filth of the house, on the other the Tower ditch, so that the stench of the house infected him with divers diseases.'

During his sickness he 'had mourned, called, and cried for help, but in vain.' The system for which these men were sufferers was formally allowed by the Parliament to continue till December 29 (1553), so that all the punishments of the first year, the deprivation of bishops by commissions, lay and clerical, some for the form of their licence, some for being married, both sanctioned by Acts of Parliament, were clearly illegal stretches of the Supremacy. Canon Dixon thus notes the state of affairs at the end of the year 1553:—

'The married clergy were silenced from their functions and exposed to the storm which was soon to overtake them. . . . Many of the former professors and instruments of the Reformation were fled beyond seas. There remained the resolute men who were prepared to stand by the Reformation and to suffer for it. Of them many were already in prison, some without trial, upon various suspicions. . . . Heresy and schism were the reproaches that were ignorantly hurled against a movement that had never ceased to be Catholic in the midst of all calamities and excesses. . . . The liturgical reformation which we have seen to have been the work of the clergy, and to have been carried out well upon the whole, was now to be rejected, and the principles thereof refused' (pp. 95-6).

The next point which strikes us forcibly in reading of these sad scenes is the brutality, insolence, and ignorance of the 'Romanensian' examiners and judges who summoned the

Anglican confessors before them. On this ground we shall hardly be able to save Bonner, who is mildly treated by Canon Dixon, from occupying a leading position. This worthy is first introduced to us as uttering a brutal jest at the misfortunes of his predecessor (p. 49). Presently we find him displaying his knowledge of Church history by laying it down, 'All are heretics who teach and believe that the administration of the sacraments and all orders of the Church are most pure that come nighest to the order of the Primitive Church. The Church was then in her infancy' (p. 63). If this may be excused on the grounds of Dr. Newman's doctrine of development, what shall we say to the following. In the examination of Philpot, Bonner *loquitur*—

'You did not well to ask him to make a prayer; that is a thing they take a singular pride and glory in. They are like in this point to certain *arrant heretics*, of whom Pliny makes mention, that daily sang *antelucanos hymnos*, praise unto God before the dawning of the day. Philpot hastened to accept the likeness between himself and the early Christians, who were, indeed, as arrant heretics as he, and the horrified Bourne interposed that they should go at once to whatever it was that was to be said' (pp. 474-5).

In the Convocation we might expect to meet the most able of the disputants in favour of the old superstitions, but the disquisition which Canon Dixon gives us exhibits arguments which are 'painfully insufficient.' The attempt of the Prolocutor to gag discussion by subscription was nothing less than scandalous, and the words with which he is represented to have closed the farcical proceedings in Convocation exactly represent the state of the case, though Canon Dixon will not vouch for them: 'Go your ways; you have the word, and we the sword' (p. 91). In all the examinations the accused persons are saluted as 'beasts' and 'vermin,' scoffed and railed at, when by their arguments they often reduce their examiners to a standstill (p. 472). 'Thou art the veriest beast that ever I knew,' says Bonner to the learned Archdeacon Philpot. 'Thou shalt burn for thy heresy and afterwards go to hell-fire,' says Morgan to the same' (p. 482). At the senseless discussion at Oxford Cranmer, Ridley, and Latimer were overwhelmed with taunts, gibes, and clamour; and there is absolutely no record of any fair, calm, and judicial hearing of the case of the Reformers. Another remarkable and most painful characteristic of the persecution is the intense ferocity of the Queen, backed by her obedient Council. The calm savagery of her letter at the beginning of the persecution has often been commented upon: 'Touch-

189
ing
don
just
simp
pass
of a
Her

'And
them
shall
espec
some
sermo

H
her su
lie id
impos
a 'sev
ment
were c
procee
ferred t
God, a
same t
search
(p. 361)
Queen'
commis
particu
central
should
difficult
be sent.
as it wa
the Spa
letters o
Stafford
been han
would so
proclama
for the s
them. I
late, exc
victim fr

ing the punishment of heretics, methinketh it ought to be done without rashness, not leaving in the meanwhile to do justice to such as by learning would seem to deceive the simple.' (As a comment upon this it may be observed in passing that of those burned about 250 belonged to the class of artificers and husbandmen, including fifty-five women.) Her Majesty proceeds —

'And the rest so to be used that the people might well perceive them not to be condemned without just occasion; whereby they shall both understand the truth and beware to do the like. And especially within London I should wish none to be burnt without some of the Council's presence; and both there and everywhere good sermons at the same' (p. 236).

Having thus calmly prepared the stake for a good portion of her subjects, her Majesty was determined that it should not lie idle. The bishops naturally shrank from the horrid task imposed upon them; so to them the King and Queen addressed a 'severe letter of remonstrance,' expressing their astonishment that when heretics were 'brought to the ordinaries they were either not received, or else not travailed with, neither proceeded with according to the order of justice; but suffered to continue in their errors, to the dishonour of Almighty God, and dangerous example of others' (p. 363). At the same time the lay authorities were bid to make more diligent search for heretics, and to make use of spies and informers (p. 361). These measures not proving sufficient to satisfy the Queen's zeal, in February 1557 were issued new and stringent commissions, which, as Canon Dixon observes (p. 572), are particularly memorable in that they endeavoured to create a central tribunal in London, of which the approved Bonner should be the judge, to whom all cases of heresy considered too difficult or important to be disposed of by the ordinary, might be sent. This was the cause of some terror even to the orthodox, as it was thought it was the beginning of the establishment of the Spanish Inquisition. The *Council Book* of 1557 contains letters of reproof to the sheriffs of Kent, Essex, Suffolk, and Staffordshire for delaying the execution of those who had been handed over to them by the ordinary. Fiendish cruelty would seem to have reached its culminating point when a proclamation ordered that no man should presume to pray for the sufferers, or to say 'God help them' and encourage them. It had always been held that a recantation, however late, except in the case of a relapsed person, should save a victim from the stake. But this was not allowed to be the

case in the days of Mary. Thomas Bembridge, a gentleman of the diocese of Winchester, had been examined and condemned to the stake by Bishop White. He was placed on the pile, but when he felt the first agonies of the flame at his feet he exclaimed, 'I recant,' and was immediately rescued by his friends.

'He was carried back to prison, where he is said to have recanted his recantation. If that were so, it was not the cause of his death; but that he had gone beyond the limit of mercy before he recanted in the fire. The Queen reprimanded Sir Richard Pexall, the merciful sheriff who had stayed the burning, and ordered the execution to proceed out of hand: allowing the condemned to confer with learned and discreet men, to be appointed by the bishop, for the confirmation of his faith, if he was, as he pretended, a Catholic, and in his death to assist him by their comfort to die God's servant. He was burned with horrible cruelty at the beginning of August, a week after his former taste of the fire' (p. 713).

This was the same measure which was designed to be meted out to Archbishop Cranmer, whose numerous recantations were never intended to save him from the flames, though he himself was deluded by the expectation of life. In his account of this difficult passage in the history of the persecution Canon Dixon is, we think, not at his best. The obscurity of the transactions which surround the closing of Cranmer's life has hardly been dissipated by his narrative. What is evident is that the friars at Oxford, who were to tempt him by the sweets of life, were in complete understanding with the authorities in London who had determined on his death. He was to die, but he was to die disgraced. Having been made to deliver the most emphatic protest that could be devised against the doctrine which he had advocated and upheld, and thus condemn most distinctly the great work of his life, he was to be given over to the flames, that his body might suffer the extremity of torment, as his character and memory had been made to suffer. This was the vengeance designed by the Queen for him who had pronounced her mother's divorce and been the ringleader in heretical pravity. The studious care with which the determination to put him to death was concealed from Cranmer, evidently from the fear lest he should retract his recantation, and the expectation he was allowed to cherish that, after a public appearance as one condemned to the stake and the open proclamation of his recantation, his life should be spared, were all carefully designed to carry out this scheme to the full. On what other ground can Dr. Cole's secret instructions be explained, or the anger which was

exc
Hoo
of h
mar
had
on t

be t
canta
of att
his tr
By h
may
heret
beyon
self a
in the
that
astoni
could
simpli
under
... C
His la
He ha
which
stretch
in self
service
be mea
tions o
of the
some o
It may
like th
greater
of Eng
capacity
scopal
Church
of bisho
in Chris

A
Regina
and sp
There
essentia

excited by the premature publication of the recantation? Dr. Hook, in his *Life of Cranmer*, argues that only on the ground of his expecting the offer of life can he claim the dignity of martyr. Canon Dixon does not accept the view that Cranmer had any expectation of being spared, but he has some words on the subject which are worth quoting.

'If Cranmer was not a martyr, he was a murdered man. It may be true that he was beyond the letter of the canon law. His recantation proper, the paper to which he set his hand in the presence of attesting witnesses, was posterior to his degradation, posterior to his tradition to the secular arm, posterior to the writ for burning him. By holding out till he was condemned and ordered for execution it may be that he had put himself in the position of an obstinate heretic, as the word was abused by his enemies. But he was not beyond the equity of the law. By his recantation he declared himself a Catholic, not only in the genuine sense of the word, but even in the Roman or debased sense of it. To execute upon him after that the doom of heresy, was murder. . . . Both his fall and the astonishing inspiration by which he, at least in part, retrieved it could only have occurred in a character many-sided with an essential simplicity. . . . To think that he acted with calculation is to misunderstand him. He could calculate for others, but not for himself. . . . Cranmer was courageous in his timidity and timid in his courage. His last actions were sublime, but in doing them he was homely. He had no design of majesty and show, when he used that gesture in which his countrymen will ever see him; and the moment before he stretched his hand into the flame he had been searching his breast in self-mistrust to find an humble answer to a Spanish friar. . . . The services which this prelate rendered to the Church of England might be measured by the praises of her sons no less than by the maledictions of her enemies, if her sons were unanimous in praises. But some of the keenest of the arrows that have sought him have been shot by some of those who are not low in the roll of Anglican worthies. . . . It may be that in time he will rise a little in the estimation of men like those who have decried him. His merits and services were greater than his faults. He preserved the continuity of the Church of England. He gave to the English Reformation largeness and capacity. . . . His death completed the circle of five men of episcopal degree who loosed the yoke of Rome from the neck of the Church of England by the sacrifice of their lives—a glorious crown of bishops, the like of which is set upon the brow of no other Church in Christendom' (pp. 549-52).

A large part of this volume is naturally occupied by Reginald Pole, his sayings and doings. His letters, sermons, and speeches appear to be quoted at unnecessary length. There is nothing specially interesting in them. Pole was essentially a weak man. He could write letters and speeches,

but he could not carry out his principles in action. He was amiable rather than cruel, and could never have approved of the persecution; yet he tolerated it, and in his daily interviews with the Queen could not have taken a stand against it. He has been accused of being loose, if not dishonest, in financial matters, but this was probably more from carelessness than intentional wrong. Canon Dixon says very justly—

‘It was not in the management of money but of men and affairs that the defects of the character of Pole were discernible. In the heat of the persecution he abandoned his diocese to reckless subalterns, shutting his eyes to their rigours, willing not to know what was done by them, though feeling himself bound not to forbid it. He made such works as he did, the synod, the monetary trust, an excuse and screen, to keep alive the applause of conscience and the appearance of active and spontaneous exertion’ (p. 629).

Dr. Hook has brought against Pole the terrible charge that, though averse to persecution and utterly disliking it, he nevertheless became an active persecutor, in order to recommend himself to the Pope, who had condemned him. This charge is, we think, met by the fact that persecution went on in Pole’s diocese long before he had incurred the anathemas of the furious Pope, Paul IV. We think Canon Dixon’s view is the true one. He did not like persecution, but he shut his eyes to it and tolerated it because it was the Queen’s pleasure. Certainly in the last year of his life, when under the Pope’s ban, we find him taking a somewhat more active part in the work. In that year he issued a new commission to his archdeacon, Nicholas Harpsfield, and others, and five persons were discovered, examined, and condemned.

‘These five persons were kept in prison to November, when they were burned alive in Canterbury, what time Pole lay on his death-bed, a week before his death. . . . The voice of history has acquitted Pole of their death, on the account that it is improbable that he could have known of it; but history has neglected to note that it was he who gave them over to death four months before’ (p. 715).

In surveying this troublous time two points especially attract the attention and admiration of the Church historian. The first is the wonderful constancy and courage of the sufferers. Many, no doubt, after their apprehension faltered in their faith and were released, but that so large a number of all grades and qualities should have stood firm, and elected to undergo the awful death by fire rather than abandon their convictions, is truly amazing. The Jesuit Parsons made an

elabo
have
Ang
the l
MSS
volum
Now
train
fered
Edwa
withi
held
attem
could
argum
of the
Farr
ing in
in the
stirred
vinced
by an
eterna
mistak
girl le
same r
consider
strongl

‘A
of the F
wishes i
the mer
temptu
the woes
Reforma
ill comm
many pla
was not
preached
(p. 13).

‘Her
which m
and cour
beginning
none suc
may be

elaborate attempt to diminish the number of those said to have suffered, and he has been too much followed by an Anglican writer, who seemed to have the same object in view, the late Dr. Maitland. But Foxe's account is supported by MSS. in the Harleian Collection, and in Canon Dixon's volume we have the names, dates, and places of the sufferers. Now it must be remembered that these persons had not been trained from childhood in the faith for which now they suffered, that it was only during the few years of the reign of Edward that Scriptural and primitive teaching had been within their reach, and yet they had grasped it so firmly, and held it so intelligently, that frequently the divines who attempted to convince them were completely nonplussed, and could do nothing more than hand them over to the last argument of the stake. And here in the midst of the agonies of the flames they maintained an unconquerable courage. Farrar, Bishop of St. David's, had told one who was hesitating in his faith, that if he saw him shrink in the least degree in the flames he might conclude that his creed was false. He stirred not in the slightest degree, and his friend was convinced. Cramer, so long vacillating, at the last was animated by another spirit, and at the stake 'caught and clutched eternal glory, inventing a sign that could not be hidden or mistaken' (p. 542). Weak women, girls and boys, the blind girl led by her little brother to the stake, all alike showed the same marvellous courage. And this suggests to us that other consideration on which the Church historian cannot too strongly insist.

'A universal opinion,' says Canon Dixon, 'was diffused that none of the Reformed would stand to their profession; that the Queen's wishes in religion had but to be intimated for all to obey them; that the mere menace of severity would dissipate resistance. This contemptuous estimation was indeed one of the causes that brought on the woes of the reign. It was a dangerous position to hold that the Reformation would vanish at command. The Reformation, however ill commended by the conduct of its adherents, had taken root in many places. The English service was used in parish churches . . . it was not altogether for nothing that the reformed doctrines had been preached for seven [? six] years by the zealous licentiates of Edward' (p. 13).

'Her reign . . . proved that there was in the Reformation that for which men might dare to die: and that there were men of constancy and courage among those who upheld the Reformation. Before the beginning of the persecution the belief was prevalent that there were none such; that the reformers, gossellers, protestants, or what they may be called, were a horde of hypocrites and time-servers, whose

only desire was to keep the booty for which they had canted: and whom the threat of severity, or at most the mere exposure to danger, would be enough to drive the Queen's way. From this conviction it was that in the first year of the reign so many priests and justices had the boldness to anticipate the alteration of the laws: or that Gardiner, a statesman, fell in with the persecution, of which he instantly, but too late, learned the futility' (p. 731).

To have established unmistakably the firm foundation of the English Reform, to have surrounded the English Prayer Book with a halo never to be dissipated, to have glorified the cleansing of the Church from the old superstitions by so great a cloud of witnesses, to have given stability to that which they most hated, was the boon which that savage queen and her satellites, in spite of themselves, conferred upon the Church of England. There is good reason to believe that the actual conversion to Reforming opinions went on at a quicker rate during the reign of Mary, and in the midst of the burnings, than it had done in the reign of Edward. When Elizabeth came to the throne the nation was Protestant. A miserably small number of the clergy refused to accept the restoration of the English Prayer Book. The persecution, even in the dioceses where it raged the hottest, had not only failed to root out Reforming opinions, but had actually been unable to repress regular religious assemblages for worship according to the English Prayer Book. In Bonner's own diocese there existed through all the persecution a congregation, varying in number from 40 up to 200, which maintained constant meetings for religion during the whole of Mary's reign. The ministers of this congregation were Scambler, afterwards Bishop of Peterborough; Foule; Rough, who was put to death by Bonner; Augustine Bernher; and finally Thomas Bentham, who continued in charge till the death of Queen Mary.

There are some other matters to be noted in this volume besides the history of the persecution. At p. 73 Weston, the Prolocutor of Convocation, is made to say, 'That blasphemous and erroneous book, which they call the Book of Common Prayer, never passed our Houses.' Upon this Canon Dixon notes, 'In my third volume I have given reasons for concluding that the Prayer Book was never submitted to Convocation in the reign of Edward. Or rather,' he says, correcting himself, 'I have exhibited the reasons both *for* and *against* that conclusion.' From what we remember of the third volume, the reasons *for* were certainly favoured by the writer rather than those *against*. We are glad to find by the

1 Jo
2 T
edited
Series,
3 An
(Englan
Council
declares

wording of this note that the view favoured in vol. iii. is somewhat shaken. Messrs. Gasquet and Bishop, in their recent work on the First Prayer Book, are also of opinion that it was not submitted to Convocation. But their statement of the evidence is somewhat incomplete. This is a matter of some importance, though not vital, as there can be no question of the present Prayer Book having received the deliberate sanction of Convocation. We maintain, however, in spite of faltering friends and insidious enemies, that both the First and Second Prayer Books drawn up under Edward VI. were submitted to Convocation. And first, with respect to the First Book. From certain rough notes which have been preserved we know that the examination of the new Divine Service was put down on the agenda for November 22, 1547. Was it then examined? Between that date and the time when it was brought into Parliament (December 19) there was ample time for an examination. Did it take place? The King's answer to the Devonshire rebels distinctly affirms that it did, and argues from this as to the authority of the Book. 'Whatsoever is contained in our book . . . is by our Parliament established, *by our whole clergy agreed, yea, by the bishops of the realm devised.*'¹ In the same way Nicholas Udall, addressing the same insurgents, speaking of this Prayer Book, says, 'Hath *the whole Convocation* and Parliament, upon mature examination thereof, allowed it for service most godly and most mete to be uniformly used throughout the King's dominions, and so admitted it by a law?'² Why are these assertions to be discredited? But an absolutely conclusive proof remains in the fact that the Council, writing to Bishop Bonner, who objected to the use of the book, allege that 'the book was approved and set forth by the bishops and all other learned men of the realm in their *synods and convocations provincial.*' It is clearly absurd to suppose that this could have been used as an argument to Bonner, who was as much cognizant of all the facts as anyone, if he had known the contrary to be the case.³ Lord Selborne comments thus on the evidence: 'It is not surprising that evidence such as this convinced even Dean Stanley of the assent of Convocation

¹ Joyce, *England's Sacred Synods*, p. 471.

² 'Troubles connected with the Prayer Book of 1549.' Documents edited by Nicholas Pocock. *Camden Society Publications*, 1884, New Series, xxxvii. p. 169. See also p. 144.

³ Another most important piece of evidence is mentioned by Joyce (*England's Sacred Synods*, p. 471). 'A letter indited by his Majesty's Council to the Lady Mary on the subject of her chaplain saying Mass declares that such a proceeding is "a contempt of the ecclesiastical

to the Book of 1548-9.¹ As regards the Second Book, it was certainly drawn up by a committee of Convocation. It was probably submitted to the whole Convocation. It was certainly confirmed by the acceptance by Convocation of the forty-two Articles of Religion, which give it an express sanction. The notion that the First Book was not submitted to Convocation is due to a random shot of Peter Heylin, who, desirous to defend his patron Laud's utterly illegal introduction of the Scotch Book under the royal sanction, ventures the assertion that the same thing had been done by Edward VI. and Elizabeth. No one conversant with the worthy Peter's method of arguing would think much of this random assertion. It is probable that Weston's assertion refers not to the First but to the Second Book of Edward.

Canon Dixon frequently refers to the book of Gardiner, *De Vera Obedientia*, written to suit his master, Henry VIII., and strongly directed against the supremacy of the Pope. This book was a terrible difficulty to the unfortunate divine when he had changed his views to suit another authority, and had adopted the Papal supremacy, which before he had repudiated. It was put forth with a preface, usually attributed to Bonner, but which Canon Dixon will not accept as his, grounding himself on the authority of Dr. Maitland. Now Dr. Maitland was an ingenious man who spent his life in trying to upset received opinions, and, it must be confessed, with very considerable success. But old opinions have a habit of reasserting themselves, and sometimes die hard. If the preface was not written by Bonner, by whom was it written? It is quite sufficiently strong in the assertion of the opinions of the day to make its writer acceptable to the ruling power. Why, then, did he not reveal himself and claim his reward? If Bonner did not write the preface he certainly got the reward for it, being advanced by Thomas Cromwell to the see of Hereford, and afterwards to that of London, when he was willing to hold his episcopal jurisdiction on a licence from the King. The sort of indulgent kindness with which Canon Dixon treats Bonner all through the volume is very remarkable. He acknowledges that he put his prisoners cruelly in the stocks when they did not please him, that he beat them with his own hands, that he made them lodge in his coal-house, that he condemned to the fire numbers of illiterate, helpless people, after having over-

orders of this Church of England." The contempt of 'ecclesiastical orders' can only mean contempt of proper synodical sanction. See also the evidence of Archbishop Abbott and Archbishop Bancroft.

¹ *Defence of the Church*, p. 52.

whelmed them with insults and reproaches. We are unable to discover the extenuating circumstances which lead the historian to describe this brutal and ignorant man merely as an 'odddy;' and we would contrast the treatment meted out by Bonner to his prisoners with that which he himself received in the next reign. Though committed to the Marshalsea at the beginning of the reign, he was afterwards allowed to reside in his own house and garden, being unable, indeed, to venture out, lest he should be torn in pieces by the people. One of the not least striking passages in this volume is that which describes the character of the Pope, Paul IV., and the change which took place under him in the policy of the Papacy.

'This was the man who gave to the austere spirit which was entering into the Papacy the bent which it has never lost. A man of nearly eighty years of age, tall, muscular, and elastic, of rapid gait; a man of furious temper and ruthless will—it was he who founded the Theatines, one of the religious orders of that age, which combined the clerical and monastic life; it was he who had reconstituted the Inquisition sixteen years before, making it central and universal, hiring a house in Rome for head-quarters, and generously furnishing it as a gymnasium for heretics with blocks, bars, chains, and the rest of the requisite instruments of exercise. . . . The Papacy, under the appearance of generosity, splendour, and culture, had from this time a secret grip which restricted intellectual freedom, stopped the flow of learning, and withered the life of nations. The Papacy henceforth existed not for the Christian religion, as under Gregory the Great; not for the human race, as under Hildebrand; not for the arts, as under Nicholas the Fifth, but for its own claims, which were continually increased. Whatever the character of the Pope henceforth, the Popedom was the same. It was become a system of continuous institutions from which the reigning Pope could never escape. Of these institutions some of the most formidable were now first created, or worked in full power now for the first time—the Society of Jesus, the Roman Inquisition, and that branch of it which strangled intellectual liberty by the Index' (pp. 380-81).

In a note, Canon Dixon goes so far as to describe the modern Papacy as 'the greatest calamity that humanity has ever known.' We cannot but think that the revelations of this volume, and the bringing together in one view the whole picture of the terrible exhibition of this policy in England, may do something to check the growth of this 'calamity,' and to reveal the danger that lies hid in the soft advances of the Papal claims; for though of course modern society would not now tolerate ecclesiastical burnings, and even the most vicious Papalist could not hand over to the sheriff an unfortunate wretch to be put to death in tortures, yet, as Rome never changes, the

principle on which these executions were founded remains the same, and has never been disowned. That principle is that those connected with the 'Chair of St. Peter' have the *right* to coerce everyone that they can to accept their system of belief in its entirety, on the ground that outside of it and without it there is no salvation. On this point the sentiments of Pio Nono did not probably differ from those of Paul IV., the only difference arising on considerations of policy, power, and method. In fact, Rome claims now, as she did in the days of Mary, the right to tyrannize over the human conscience, and to assail it in ways sometimes gentle and insidious, sometimes fierce and murderous, in order to make it prostrate itself before the ever shifting and varying programme of Roman doctrine.

ART. X.—THE INTERMEDIATE STATE.

The Intermediate State between Death and Judgment, being a Sequel to 'After Death.' By HERBERT MORTIMER LUCKOCK, D.D., Canon of Ely. (London, 1890.)

DR. LUCKOCK has made the future state a special study. Some years ago he published a treatise, entitled *After Death*, which was well received and went through several editions; and now we have the present treatise on the *Intermediate State*. The two treatises take up different grounds, though at certain points they are intermingled. In regard to *After Death*, he tells us in the preface to the present work that it was written to elucidate three important questions regarding the Intermediate State—viz. (1) the lawfulness of praying in any way for the dead, (2) the grounds for believing in the intercessions of the dead on our behalf, and (3), as a consequence of this belief, the legitimacy of the practice of addressing appeals to the dead for their help or intercession. Dr. Luckock further tells us that the publication of the first treatise led him into a large correspondence both with friends and strangers, in which, as was very natural, many kindred questions were opened up. It is with these latter questions that he has attempted to deal in the present work. And it is only fair to the author to notice the distinction between the conditions which attach to the two works. The first treatise had for its basis authorities which could not be questioned; its foundation was, in fact, secure. In regard to the questions raised in the present work

it is different. There are, it is true, authorities for these also; but on many points we are obliged to be satisfied with inferences. The present work, in fact, possesses more of a speculative character. And yet the author is, on the whole, restrained. He does not, like some recent writers, give the rein to his imagination, but painfully and carefully gathers together all the scattered lights bearing on his points, and many will be grateful to him for so doing.

The present age is one which especially requires guidance on the momentous questions regarding the future state. For this there are reasons, partly theological, and partly of a different character. From a theological point of view, we have to face the collapse of the Calvinistic theology. That stern and rigid system, which still has such a hold over the minds of our people, has undoubtedly broken down in the narrow and distorted view that it gives of the future state. Writers of almost every school of theological thought have risen in revolt against it. The point which these adversaries especially insist upon is that it attributes to God a hardness and vindictiveness in the punishment of sin which is not to be reconciled with our ideas of justice, much less of goodness. It is not to be denied that there is some truth in this representation. But the danger would be very great if these opponents of Calvinism were to carry the day without some qualifying view. The result would be to create an impression that God does not punish sin, and that men need not any longer fear Him. Hence the necessity of going back far beyond the Calvinistic development to those primitive views of the future in which the action of God in dealing with the sinner appears in a far different light. In the Primitive Church, with its faith in the intermediate state, the action of God in punishing sin appears in a light which is pre-eminently reasonable, and which comes home to the conscience, and explains that instinctive dread of retribution which besets the sinner. What is wanted is that these primitive views of the future should be popularised and spread far and wide. The result, we think, would be eminently salutary. It would increase rather than diminish the dread of judgment. If preachers would only dwell not so much upon the endless flames of hell as on what the soul may have to go through in the intermediate state; if they would impress upon men that a life of sin, even though the soul is saved by an act of repentance and faith, entails sad consequences, that it involves in the intermediate state a system of discipline and castigation, a painful retracing of false footsteps, and - what is worse - the necessity

of taking a lower place in the eternal kingdom ; if this course were systematically pursued, men's fear and horror of sin would, we think, be enhanced rather than diminished.

But besides these obvious theological reasons, there are others of a more general character. The advance of the present age in culture and education has created a craving for more definite knowledge as regards the future. We see this manifested in many ways, some of them very questionable. It is not that a cultivated age is more addicted to belief in a future state. On the contrary, faith in the future exists more solidly among primitive peoples and the uneducated. But the presence of culture creates a craving for more definite knowledge. Culture, in fact, brings with it doubt and scepticism, and those who recoil from such doubt wish to have definite grounds on which to rest their faith. It is thus of great importance that the scattered lights of revelation should be gathered together, so as to form a solid ground on which the believer may rest his faith.

But here the question arises, Is such definite knowledge of the future state at all possible? It might be urged that it is quite impossible, and this partly on grounds of philosophy and partly on the silence of Divine Revelation. It might be urged from the point of view of philosophy that, the conditions of the future life being quite different from the conditions of the present, it is quite impossible for us to attain any definite knowledge of it. It is an admitted principle of philosophy that our power of imagining—that is, our power of picturing forth or forming a definite idea of things—is rigorously confined to experience. Only those things which have been presented in experience can be represented or pictured forth by the imagination as definite knowledge. For instance, it is quite impossible to communicate to one born blind a definite idea of colours or of a landscape, for the reason that he has had no experience of these things. So, it might be argued, it is quite impossible to communicate to us who are living in the flesh any definite idea of life in the spirit, in which all the conditions are quite different from anything we have experienced. There is truth in this representation, and it obviously receives countenance from the experience of St. Paul when he was caught up into the third heaven. He there heard words which were unspeakable, and which it was not possible to utter. But, though this mode of viewing the matter is true enough, it must not be carried too far. We may admit it to this extent, that it is quite impossible for us to picture or imagine the actual scenes, the surroundings,

and
in w
hand
that
and
the
This
the p
the l
whic
tion,
we m
that
true
but e
deal.
blind
them
B
Reve
able.
retice
where
plainl
Holy
too fa
retice
In tru
at the
New
were
except
instan
Lazar
But th
ture b
and on
it he l
the ma
whole.
numbe
with w
The
is the p
absolut

and the mode of life of the departed, so different is the world in which they live and move from ours. But, on the other hand, it is to be borne in mind that it is only the imagination that is chained down to experience, and that man has other and higher faculties of knowledge. We have, in addition to the imagination, the higher consciousness or intelligence. This is also a faculty of knowledge, and, as it is the seat of the personality, it is certain that it persists and passes into the life to come. We know by the intelligence a great deal which it is quite impossible to picture forth in the imagination, and all such knowledge as is proper to the intelligence we may have of the future life. On reflection we shall find that by this means we may know a great deal about it. It is true that we cannot picture forth the scenes and surroundings; but even about these we may know by the intelligence a great deal. How much, for instance, is it possible to tell one born blind about landscapes, although, never having experienced them, he is quite unable to picture them.

But it might be further urged from the point of view of Revelation, that a definite view of the future life is unattainable. It might be urged that Holy Scripture is singularly reticent about it, and that it often stops short just at the point where we might have hoped that it would have spoken out plainly. Here again, we must admit, there is great truth. Holy Scripture is reticent. Still, we must not carry this idea too far. It would be carrying it too far to say that it is so reticent that no articulate view about the future is possible. In truth, a great deal of this reticence is due to the fact that at the time the books of Scripture, especially those of the New Testament, were written, very definite views of the future were generally prevalent, and that the truth of these views, except where corrected, is taken for granted. How much, for instance, is taken for granted in the parable of Dives and Lazarus, or in the words of our Lord to the penitent thief. But the fact is, there is a great deal more in Holy Scripture bearing on the future than most people are aware of; and one of the great merits of Dr. Luckock's work is that in it he has with great care and pains tried to gather together the many scattered lights and to form them into a consistent whole. Many people will be quite surprised to find what a number of passages he has brought to bear upon the points with which he deals.

The first point to which Dr. Luckock addresses himself is the proof of the intermediate state. Unhappily, this is an absolutely necessary preliminary, owing to the extensive

denial of it in our day. In the popular view, heaven and hell are regarded as the immediate issues of the present life ; and it is really this view that has occasioned all the difficulties and scepticism of the present day. The arrangements of this life and the state of things which God has seen fit to permit, the partial diffusion of Christianity, the multitude of the heathen and the multitude of those in Christian lands to whom the Gospel has never come, the unequal distribution of moral and spiritual advantages, the atmosphere of iniquity in which multitudes of souls are nurtured—these and many kindred difficulties have been insisted as reasons why impenitent sinners should not be committed to hell. It is urged also that the eternal flames of hell make up a punishment which is out of all proportion to the transgression, and that it is unjust, considering the ignorance and the disadvantages which attach to the majority of sinners. But if sinners are not to be consigned to hell, there is no other place, if we accept the popular view, to which they can be sent except heaven. But here it is that we place ourselves in direct contradiction to Holy Scripture. Nothing can be clearer than the verdict of Scripture, that only those who die in the Lord are blessed. It is a difficulty which perplexes and appals, and which shakes or destroys the faith of many. It were well if people could be brought to see that it is wholly created by the denial of the intermediate state. We have here, in fact, an example of what always happens when we lose sight of any portion of the faith or destroy its just proportion. We land ourselves in enormous difficulties.

It is interesting to inquire how this state of things has come about. Dr. Luckock traces it back to the Reformation, and he has given the leading passages on which the denial of the intermediate state, so far as England is concerned, rests. We have first of all in the Homily against Fear of Death the remark that 'death delivering us from our bodies doth send us straight home into our own country, and maketh us to dwell presently with God for ever in everlasting rest and quietness.'¹ It is a passage which is not explicit, yet it indicates a doctrine which tends to the complete denial of the intermediate state. It was followed up by the Assembly of Divines at Westminster with a statement about which there can be no doubt. They stated :

'The bodies of men after death return to dust, and see corruption ; but their souls (which neither die nor sleep), having an immortal subsistence, immediately return to God who gave them. The souls

¹ *The Intermediate State*, p. 17.

of the righteous, being made perfect in holiness, are received into the highest heavens, where they behold the face of God in light and glory, waiting for the full redemption of their bodies; and the souls of the wicked are cast into hell, where they remain in torments and utter darkness, reserved to the judgment of the great day. Besides these two places for souls separated from their bodies, the Scripture acknowledgeth none.¹

The high authority attaching to the Homilies had an extensive influence on opinion in the Church; and the equally high authority of the Westminster Divines determined the opinions of Nonconformists. Thus it came to pass that up to a recent period, with the exception of many learned divines of the High Church school, opinion in England was completely shaped and determined in this groove.

But if we would have a just estimate of the significance of this movement we must go further back than the Reformation. The truth is that the doctrine adopted at the Reformation was but the outcome of a great religious development which extended back for many centuries. *The real origin of this view dates from the time when the Roman doctrine of Purgatory originated.* This latter doctrine grew out of the Primitive doctrine of the intermediate state. It was a narrowing down of the Primitive doctrine; attention being directed exclusively to the purifying process which forms only one of the aspects of the Primitive doctrine. As time went on the Purgatorial doctrine became more and more fixed and defined. It was treated of in the mediæval schools, and gradually it assumed a form which was practically a negation of the intermediate state. This is a point which merits our best attention. The intermediate state, according to the Primitive doctrine, is a place where both the just and the wicked are kept waiting till the return of Christ and the Judgment. But Purgatory, when completed as a doctrine, became a merely temporary abode. It was a stage on the road to heaven—a period of detention shorter or longer according to the number of sins that had to be purged. Nor was this all. It was likewise held that Purgatory was not necessary for all. It was necessary only for those who had sins to be purged, but not for those of saintly life. These latter passed at once to the joys and glories of heaven. Thus gradually it came to pass that the eyes of men were fixed upon heaven as the real goal and sequence of the present life. And since alongside of Purgatory there grew up the idea that the souls of the wicked are consigned at once to

¹ *Confession of Faith*, chap. xxxii.

hell, we see how heaven and hell in the eyes of the Mediæval Church became the issues of the present life. For many centuries this idea had been fixed in the minds of Christians, and had profoundly influenced and modified other portions of the faith; and hence we can see how the Reformers, when feeling keenly the abuses connected with Purgatory, amended those abuses by simply striking out Purgatory from the list of doctrines, and continued the idea which had gradually grown up, that souls at death are drafted off to heaven or to hell.

In bringing forward the proofs of the intermediate state from Holy Scripture and from the Fathers, Dr. Luckock begins with a general consideration which we think has hardly received the attention it deserves. He points out that Holy Scripture clearly contemplates for mankind three widely different conditions of being. There is, first, the corporeal life in the flesh—that is to say, the life which we are now living. Then, secondly, there is the life on which the soul enters at death. It is sometimes called the disembodied state; but perhaps this designation is not quite accurate. The soul is certainly disembodied so far as the fleshly body is concerned, but it is probable it carries with it some spiritual form of the nature of a body. The point, however, to be noticed is that in respect of the body this state of being is imperfect. The departed soul awaits its perfection, which will be brought about at the general resurrection. Lastly, Scripture contemplates a third state of being—the risen life. It is a state which will be entered upon at the second advent. This is the perfect state. The whole man is made perfect both in body and in soul, and in this perfect state will ascend with Christ to take possession of the eternal kingdom.

It is easily seen, if we are to give weight to these three states, that there must be an intermediate state—a state in which the departed await the coming of Christ. At all events, the denial of such a state will draw after it very grave consequences. Such a denial will have the effect of obscuring, if not of destroying, our faith in both the resurrection and the future judgment. And has not this consequence already manifested itself on the popular views of the present day? It is true that the Westminster Divines, when placing the souls of the righteous in heaven, put in a saving clause, 'waiting for the full redemption of their bodies.' But, practically, this saving clause has dropped more and more out of view. There is also a striking incongruity attached to it. How, it may be asked, can we suppose that heaven can be entered in an im-

per
to
the
ced
are
in a
rect
it r
unn

the
fact,
theo
ture,
and
to co
and
an i
right
prep
clear
not u
been
in th
inter
figure
gathe
them
judgm
In ou
it is t
and i

It
portar
St. Pa
the pa
from l
with t
Then
gether
Clearl
up fro
heaven
It mus

perfect state? The idea is quite incongruous, and is opposed to the teaching of Holy Scripture. Hence, in the popular theology, both the resurrection and the judgment have receded more and more into the background. The departed are looked upon as in heaven. They behold the face of God; in a word, they are perfect. Such being the case, the resurrection can add nothing to them; and, as for the judgment, it must, so far as they are concerned, be an empty and unmeaning form.

This depreciation of the doctrines of the resurrection and the judgment is attended with grave consequences, and, in fact, loosens and throws into confusion the whole fabric of theology. It is easy to see how opposed it is to Holy Scripture, which lays the greatest stress upon both the resurrection and the judgment. In regard to the judgment, we have only to consider the graphic picture which our Lord draws of it, and His words both to the saved and the lost, to see how high an importance He attaches to it. When He says to the righteous, 'Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world,'¹ it is clearly implied that they had not yet inherited. They had not up to then been separated from the wicked. They had been, together with the wicked, abiding in some place which, in the case of the departed, could be nothing else than the intermediate state. The same thing is also implied in another figure under which He describes the judgment—namely, His gathering out of His kingdom all things which offend and them which do iniquity. It is implied that up to the day of judgment the wicked will not be expelled from the Church. In our Lord's view the judgment (*ἡ κρίσις*) is really a crisis; it is the great crisis of humanity. Everything leads up to it, and it is final and for ever.

It is equally clear that Holy Scripture attaches great importance to the resurrection. This is especially the case with St. Paul, who continually refers to it. Take as a specimen the passage 1 Thess. iv. 16: 'The Lord Himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the Archangel, and with the trump of God; and the dead in Christ shall rise first. Then we which are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air.' Clearly, according to St. Paul, the 'dead in Christ' were raised up from some place, and as clearly that place could not be heaven, for the Lord descends from heaven to bring them. It must, therefore, have been an intermediate state where they

¹ St. Matt. xxv. 34.

awaited the resurrection. And what importance he attached to the resurrection is seen from his grand chapter to the Corinthians where he describes it. In the view of St. Paul the resurrection will be an immense step in advance. It will be the final step in the great work of our renewal by Christ, inasmuch as it will perfect in body those who have already been perfected in soul. It will effect an immense change on man's being. How grand are his words: 'The trumpet shall sound and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed.'¹ And what kind of a change this will be he tells us in another place. 'We look,' he says, 'for the Saviour from heaven, the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto His glorious body, according to the working whereby He is able to subdue all things unto Himself.'²

If this general view of the question is borne well in mind it will add increased force and cogency to the special proofs of the intermediate state which Dr. Luckock gathers out of Scripture and the Fathers. For instance, it is quite in accordance with this general view that our Lord should affirm: 'No man hath ascended up to heaven but He that came down from heaven, even the Son of Man which is in heaven.'³ Dr. Luckock finds in the words which our Lord addressed to St. Mary Magdalene: 'Touch me not, for I am not yet ascended to my Father,'⁴ a proof of the intermediate state. And clearly it is so by implication. For our Lord had already departed out of this earthly life. He had been with the dead, and had returned from thence by His resurrection. His words imply that the place whence He had returned was not heaven, for He had not yet ascended into heaven. It must, therefore, have been the place where the departed were—that is, the intermediate state, or Hades. The same thing is clear also from our Lord's words to the penitent thief: 'To-day shalt thou be with me in Paradise.'⁵ Paradise, as we shall presently see, was in the Jewish teaching a division of the intermediate state, and our Lord here declares that it was to it that both He and the penitent were to be taken on death. Then we have the parable of Dives and Lazarus, which is constructed quite in accordance with the same view of the intermediate state. Dr. Luckock understands it as applying to the intermediate state, and he rejects the view of those who hold that it is an anticipatory picture of the final states, heaven and hell. Certainly he has right on his side, for the place where both Dives and

¹ 1 Cor. xv. 52.² Phil. iii. 21.³ St. John iii. 13.⁴ St. John xx. 17.⁵ St. Luke xxiii. 43.

Lazarus were carried is expressly called Hades—*i.e.* the intermediate state; and in addition to this there is mention of Abraham's bosom, which, in the Jewish notions of the time, was a part of the intermediate state and equivalent to Paradise.

Our Lord thus sanctioned by His teaching the ordinary Jewish doctrine of the intermediate state; and surely this ought to be conclusive proof for Christians. It might, however, be objected by opponents that the proof is not conclusive, and that on the following ground. They might urge that our Lord's words apply to a time when the Christian Revelation was not established. The great Sacrifice, they might urge, had not then been offered, the Kingdom of heaven had not, as then, been opened to all believers. They might say they are prepared to allow that, previous to Christ's redemption, there was a Hades quite different from heaven or hell, where the departed were gathered, but that it was not so after. They might urge that with the redemption of Christ a new state of things arose, and the old intermediate state was brought to an end. Now, against such an argument we can set the teaching of St. Paul, and the teaching of St. John in the Book of Revelation. It is quite clear that when St. Paul and St. John wrote, the Sacrifice had been offered, the Christian dispensation had been established, and the Church had entered on her great work. And yet they teach an intermediate state just as clearly as our Blessed Lord. We have seen that in the passage already quoted from the first Epistle to the Thessalonians the intermediate state is implied. It is precisely the same with St. John. In the Book of Revelation the souls under the altar are represented as crying: 'How long, O Lord, holy and true, dost thou not judge and avenge our blood on them that dwell on the earth.' In answer to their cry they are bidden to 'rest for a little season until their fellow-servants also . . . should be fulfilled.'¹ The expression 'under the altar' denotes a part of Hades, so that these souls were viewed by St. John as being in Hades.

The truth is that the doctrine of Sheol, Hades, or the intermediate state, passed over from the Jewish Church into the Christian, the only change being the amelioration that was effected in the state of the faithful waiting. This is seen when we pass from the Scriptures to the testimony of the Primitive Fathers. Dr. Luckock has given a succession of testimonies from Justin Martyr down to St. Augustine, all of them stating in the clearest manner the faith of the Church

¹ Rev. vi. 10.

in the intermediate state. The leading idea in these testimonies is that the intermediate state is a state of waiting. The departed there await the judgment; and in this respect we see how the Primitive view is at variance with the later doctrine of Purgatory. In the later Roman doctrine, as we have seen, Purgatory is a temporary abode, a step on the road to heaven. In the Primitive view, on the other hand, there is no entrance into heaven till after the judgment. The departed await the judgment—the righteous in a better place, the wicked in a worse. Thus Justin Martyr says: 'The souls of the godly abide in some better place, and the souls of the unrighteous and wicked in a worse place, expecting the time of judgment.'¹ Justin gives another testimony, which is of the deepest interest, as it reveals the fact that certain Gnostics denied the intermediate state, and maintained that when men died their souls are taken at once to heaven. Justin's words are: 'They say that there is no resurrection, but that when men die their souls are at once taken up into heaven.'² We have seen that the modern idea that heaven and hell are the immediate issues of this life, tends to obscure the resurrection and the judgment. These heretics, it would appear, carried their idea to its logical result, the denial of both; and in consequence Justin denies to them the right to be deemed either Christians or Jews.

The subsequent testimonies are in strict agreement with those of Justin. There was, in truth, a remarkable unanimity in the Primitive Church. All agree in regarding the intermediate state as different from both heaven and hell. They regard it as a state of waiting, and of waiting till the resurrection and the judgment. Thus St. Irenæus says of Christ's disciples that they 'go to the invisible place determined for them by God, and there dwell awaiting the resurrection.'³ There is a quaintness about the expression of Tertullian to the same effect. He says of his treatise *De Paradiso*, now unhappily lost, that it was written with the view of showing that 'all souls were sequestered in Hades till the day of the Lord.'⁴ The testimonies of Lactantius, of St. Hilary, and St. Augustine, though they are to the same effect, deserve to be quoted because of their witness to the deep feeling of awe with which the Church of that day looked forward to the great judgment. Would that something of the same feeling were prevalent among ourselves! Lactantius says: 'Let no man think that souls are judged immediately after death; all

¹ *Dialog. c. Tryph.* p. 223, ed. Paris.

² *Adv. Her.* v. xxxi. 2.

³ *Ibid.* p. 307.

⁴ *De Anima*, c. 55.

are detained in one common place of safe-keeping until the time comes when the Supreme Judge shall make His scrutiny.¹ St. Hilary says: 'As the day of judgment is the eternal award either of joy or of punishment, so the hour of death orders the interval for every man by its own laws, consigning him either to Abraham or to punishment until the judgment.'² Lastly we have St. Augustine, who testifies that, 'during the interval between death and the final resurrection, men's souls are kept in hidden receptacles, according as they severally deserve rest or trouble.'³

These proofs sufficiently establish the fact of belief in the intermediate state by the Primitive Church. Something more, however, is needed if we would attain to a full understanding of the matter. In order to get a clear idea of the intermediate state, as held by the Primitive Church, it is necessary to trace the doctrine through the Jewish Church up to the time of Christ. During this period it developed under the influence of Divine Revelation, and the various phases it passed through are remarkable in themselves, and worthy of our deepest attention. The enquiry, however, has been to a certain degree obscured, owing to the position taken up by some that the ancient Jews did not believe in a future life. We think that Dr. Luckock has perhaps conceded too much to this view. Certainly, if it were true, the case of the Jews would be quite phenomenal. No ancient nation is known which had not a belief in man's immortality. It was the faith of the ancient Egyptians and Assyrians; it was the faith of the Greeks and Romans. It is also believed in by modern tribes of the lowest culture; and the relics of funeral feasts discovered in ancient caves show that it was the faith of prehistoric man. Disbelief in immortality is the exception in human history; and a study of the facts shows that it only originates after a certain stage of culture has been attained, and in connexion with a certain stage of moral declension. Even then it never attains to the status of a decided or clear view, but remains in the form of a doubt. As such it stands side by side with doubt as to the existence of God and His Providence, the binding character of the moral law, and similar questions. It would seem that when man attains a certain stage of culture he is liable to these doubts and questionings in regard to higher things; but they are again overcome by a higher stage of moral aim and life.

All evidence shows that the ancient people of God, like

¹ *Instit. Div.* iii. 21.

² See Ps. ii. *ad fin.*

³ *Enchir.* ad Lauren. c. ix.

all other nations, believed in immortality. We have the touching statement in regard to the death of the Patriarchs, that they were 'gathered to their fathers,' 'gathered to their people.' Jacob says of his own death, 'I will go down to Sheol to my son mourning.' Moses likewise was 'gathered to his people;' and the strict laws against necromancy show in the time of Moses not only a belief in the survival of the dead, but also a belief in the possibility of communicating with them. When we come down to a later period we have the story of the Witch of Endor, which is perfectly conclusive as to the faith of that age. And then there is the touching speech of King David regarding his dead child: 'I shall go to him, but he shall not return to me.' Throughout the whole history of Israel there was a firm faith in the continued existence of the departed in Sheol. And indeed, unless we posit this as the starting-point, it is impossible to understand the course of Revelation. The whole fabric of Divine Revelation in regard to the departed rests on the assumption that they still live in Sheol.

What has given occasion to the opposite opinion is the exceeding gloomy view which the ancient Jews took of the state of the departed. In the first instance, it is true, there was not this gloom. In the very earliest period the chosen people shared the common view of Primitive peoples, that the dead are gathered in Sheol according to their families, their tribes, and their nations, and that there is no distinction between good and bad. This we see from the expressions regarding the Patriarchs—that they were gathered to their fathers. This view of the departed was not necessarily a gloomy one. It might possess more or less of that character according to the idiosyncrasy of the nation or people which held it. Some nations took brighter and some gloomier views of the departed. Nor is there anything in the earliest times to show that the view of the Patriarchs was exceptionally gloomy. But afterwards a change came on; and it merits our especial attention, as it forms the initial stage of Divine Revelation. When the Pentateuch was written and became a national possession, we see at once how profoundly it must have influenced opinion; and there is no doubt it did influence in a striking way the views of the nation in regard to the departed. The story of the Fall, and the awful words, 'In the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die,' stood in the front of the Book of God. Here was something which must profoundly modify the Israelite's view of death. Death could no longer be regarded merely as a departure to the

un-
sin.
Tha
lie
this
gloo

Jew
cons
or s
bod
the
ligh
Sheo
it is
a pla
I sh
shad
of th
light

I
lay i
depr
in fo
aslee
was
neith
dead
silenc
perso
conso
arous
It is
given
believ
them
down
there
and v
there
Thee
power
thing
passa

unseen land. It became a punishment, the punishment of sin. Had it not been for sin, man need not have died. That he does die is owing to sin. The departed consequently lie under the hand of the Lord; and we see at once how this idea of the retributive character of death would give a gloomy view of the state of the departed.

And so in effect it was. In death, as conceived by the Jews, the Lord withdraws His Spirit—the spirit of life. The consequence of this is that the bands which bind the *nephesh*, or soul, to the body are severed, and the *nephesh* forsakes the body and descends into Sheol. Very dark and gloomy were the ideas of Sheol. It was the underworld opposed to the light and brightness of heaven, which is the abode of God. Sheol is said to be in the depths—the depths of the earth; it is deeper than the waters and their inhabitants. And it is a place of darkness. Job says of Sheol: ‘Before I go whence I shall not return, even to the land of darkness and the shadow of death; a land of darkness as darkness itself; and of the shadow of death, without any order, and where the light is as darkness.’¹

Into this gloomy abode the departed were ushered, and lay in a state of powerlessness. They were powerless because deprived of the *ruach*, which is the spirit of life. They abode in forgetfulness, and rested in silence like those who are asleep. They were incapable of any mental effort, and, what was perhaps hardest of all to the pious Israelite, they could neither praise God nor contemplate Divine things. ‘The dead praise not the Lord, neither any that go down into silence.’² Yet, notwithstanding all this, self-consciousness and personality were not destroyed. The departed were living, conscious, and personal beings, and they were capable of being aroused and raised up from this state of feeble forgetfulness. It is the passages expressive of these gloomy ideas that have given occasion to the mistaken notion that the Jews did not believe in a future state. Dr. Luckock has singled out two of them—viz. Job xiv. 7, 10: ‘There is hope of a tree if it be cut down, that it will sprout again, and that the tender branch thereof will not cease. . . . But man dieth and wasteth away, and where is he?’ and the passage Psalm vi. 5: ‘In death there is no remembrance of Thee; in the grave who shall give Thee thanks?’ But the latter passage simply describes the powerlessness of the departed soul in reference to Divine things which was generally held; and, regarding the former passage, Dr. Oehler well remarks that it merely refers to

¹ Job x. 21, 22.

² Psalm cxv. 17.

man's disappearance from the earthly scene, and that it does not imply that he has entirely ceased to be, and that this is shown by a reference in the same chapter and other places to sojourn in the kingdom of the dead. Dr. Oehler adds: 'We may well say that man's existence after death is treated in the Old Testament so much as a thing of course that the reality of it is never a subject of doubt.'¹

We have hazarded the opinion that the gloomy view of Sheol was brought about in a great measure by Divine Revelation in its initial stage, and, if so, doubtless this gloomy view was intended in the arrangements of Providence in order to lead on to something higher. Whether this was so or not, it is certain that it actually did so. The pious Israelite could not dwell on Sheol and all that was to befall him there without being sensible of a contradiction. How could the Lord leave him in this dismal abode? The Lord loved His people; He had led them forth gloriously from the bondage of Egypt; He had helped them and governed them hitherto. The Lord was also gracious and merciful to individual souls. He received their worship and service; He encompassed them with blessings. There was a bond of communion and love between the individual soul and God up to the period of death; and then that bond was severed and all actual communion became impossible. Could it be that this state of things would last for ever? Could it be that the Lord would leave the departed soul for ever in the darkness of Sheol? Such a thing seemed incredible. Rather the Lord, who had brought out His people from the land of bondage, would also redeem their souls from Sheol. And so the hope grew up that God would not leave their souls in Sheol, but would raise them up to His own bright presence, where is the fulness of joy. It was to this glorious hope that the prophets, inspired by the Spirit, addressed themselves; and thus gradually there grew up a doctrine of deliverance from Sheol, which took the form of the doctrine of the resurrection. We find the beginnings of this doctrine in Hosea and Isaiah, and it was carried onwards in Ezekiel, till in the book of Daniel it attains to completion. And we may remark that in the fact of belief in the resurrection we have another proof of the full faith of Israel in the survival of the departed. Without this survival there could be no resurrection. Those who had ceased to exist could not be raised up.

But there is another aspect to this great question. We have seen that the earliest notion of the Jewish people re-

¹ *Old Testament Theology*, i. 250.

ga
or s
with
gath
Gra
to th
the
of G
just
sanc
had
Up
the
shad
rate
tion
was
imme
wick
of po
amel
belie
and o
It
states
Dr. I
the d
cham
were
Whet
the ex
quent
in or
that f
school
of Ed
Glory
righte
of She
Dr
names
times
design
think

garding the state of the dead was that there was no distinction or separation between the good and the bad. In common with all Primitive peoples, they believed that the dead were gathered in Sheol according to families and tribes and nations. Gradually, however, the incongruity of this view became clear to the mind of the people. As the commanding import of the moral law was more and more revealed, and the judgment of God upon sin became plain, it was felt that the end of the just and the wicked could not be the same. And this feeling, sanctioned by the prophets, led to a new conception, which had the effect of revolutionizing the whole idea of Sheol. Up to this time the gloom of Sheol was the same to all: the just man equally with the sinner lay in darkness and the shadow of death. But now there came in the idea of separate states in Sheol, and this completely altered the conception of the state of the departed. The gloomy view of Sheol was discarded, and in place of it there came to the just an immense amelioration. The just were separated from the wicked, and they dwelt in a land of brightness, of rest, and of peace. On the other hand, to the wicked there was no amelioration, but rather an aggravation of the previous belief. There came in the momentous idea of retribution, and of suffering.

It is uncertain at what precise time the idea of different states in Sheol for the just and for the wicked originated. Dr. Luckock remarks that the Jews in our Lord's time found the distinction in the words of Isaiah: 'Enter thou into thy chambers and shut the doors about thee: hide thyself as it were for a little moment, until the indignation be overpast.'¹ Whether it lies in this passage or not may be doubtful, but the expression 'chambers,' as applied to Sheol, occurs subsequently in Jewish literature. At all events, it is certain that in or about the Captivity the new view was established, and that from that time onward it was developed in the Jewish schools into a coherent system. The names of the Garden of Eden, Paradise, Abraham's bosom, 'under the Throne of Glory,' were variously used to designate the abode of the righteous, while for the wicked there was reserved the depths of Sheol or Gehenna.

Dr. Luckock devotes a chapter to investigating these names, and to it we would refer the reader. They are sometimes conceived as separate places, but more probably they designate different states. When the Jews first began to think of the departed in this new light, the expression 'the

¹ Isaiah xxvi. 20.

Garden of Eden' appears to have been used to denote the abode of the just. It was the highest picture of delight, refreshment, and peace; and it was out of this designation that Paradise, so hallowed in the associations of Christians, took its origin. Paradise, a word of Persian origin, was the term by which the Greek translators rendered the Garden of Eden.¹ Hence Paradise ought not, as is sometimes wrongly done, to be identified with Heaven. It is the abode of the blessed in the intermediate state. The expression, 'Abraham's bosom,' in like manner, arose from the quaint idea that God planted Abraham in the Garden of Eden; such being the rendering given to the words: 'He shall be like a tree planted by the water side.'² Abraham was the most prominent among the faithful departed. He was the friend of God, and the father of the faithful. And the chief recompense of the just was that they were introduced in Paradise to the companionship of Abraham. The expression, 'under the Throne of Glory,' another Jewish designation, is interesting as being, Canon Luckcock thinks, identical with the phrase in the Book of Revelation 'under the altar,' altar being equivalent to throne. All these expressions denoted in various ways the abodes of the righteous; while, on the other hand, there were for the wicked stripes and chastisements.

It might, however, be urged against this whole view that it does not carry with it authority. It confessedly originated—or, at least, was fixed and defined—after the canon of Scripture was closed. But to this it might be replied, in the first place, that if we take it broadly as the doctrine of a double state for the departed, one for the just and one for the wicked, it undoubtedly has its roots and its premises in the teaching of the prophets. In addition to this, it might further be urged that the doctrine of the future state had already gone through at least two phases, and that the movement by which it entered upon this, its third phase, was perfectly normal, and quite in the way of the previous movements. But the complete answer to such an objection is, that the whole of it is guaranteed to us and fixed by our Blessed Lord in the parable of Dives and Lazarus. The parable is constructed entirely on the lines of the then Jewish faith. We have the separation of the two states; we have the state of Lazarus named Abraham's bosom, just as Christ had before called it Paradise in His words of comfort to the penitent thief. Then we have the comfort, rest, and peace that accrued to Lazarus, and opposed to this the torment of

¹ Ἐφύτευεν ὁ θεὸς παράδεισον ἐν Ἐδέμ (Gen. ii. 8). ² Psalm i. 3.

Dives. The picture includes all the main points in the Jewish faith as it then existed, and it cannot be otherwise taken than as sanctioning the whole.

Such was the doctrine of the intermediate state as it passed over into the Christian Church; and we have now to consider how it may be applied to meet our present difficulties.

The first thing that strikes us is that we have a revelation bearing on the future state of which the Primitive Church was ignorant. We mean the long duration of the period of waiting. In the first instance, the period of waiting was supposed to be very brief. The earliest idea was that it would be only a few years. It was thought the Advent might occur at any moment, and most probably would occur in the time of those then living. It was only gradually as years slipped by that it dawned upon the Church that the time might be prolonged. How different does the matter stand now, when well-nigh two thousand years have flown past and Christ has not come? No doubt even now we are to wait and expect. This must be our constant attitude. Yet we see that the time has been long beyond expectation, and we cannot help admitting that there might be a longer time than we think before the coming. Now all this has a bearing on our view of the intermediate state. In the Primitive Church, when the time was believed to be short, very short, the idea of the intermediate state was just one of waiting. Both the just and the unjust waited for the judgment. It was natural that it should be so conceived when the time was thought to be short. But can it be conceived so any longer, now that we know that the time has been long? Can we think that the departed ones have remained all this time sealed up, as it were, and in a state of stagnation? What we would suggest is, that the simple conception of waiting should be somewhat enlarged. We suggested in a previous article on 'Future Retribution'¹ that there ought to be added to the Primitive idea the thought of progress. And we tried to gather together indications in favour of progress from various sources. It is a grand idea if we can admit it. We can by this idea form a magnificent picture of the future of the righteous. They are in joy, and in peace, and in refreshment awaiting the great day. But they are also ever advancing; they are ever mounting upwards and onwards to the final goal of perfection.

These considerations obviously admit of further developments into which our space will not permit us to enter. We

¹ See *Church Quarterly Review*, July 1888, vol. xxvi. p. 363.

leave it to our readers to pursue the subject for themselves. It is one which will more than repay all the thought they can bestow on it.

Another point that we ventured to bring forward in the above-mentioned article, and which we are glad to see Dr. Luckock to some degree accepts, was the idea of the Church in the unseen world, organized and active, and carrying on the work begun here on earth. In Primitive times the idea seems not to have had a place, or, at least, the indications of it are faint. But the long period of waiting seems to necessitate our supposing something of the kind. Century after century has flown past, each bearing into the unseen countless hosts of souls. The numbers of the Church behind the veil are swelling day by day, and it now outnumbers inconceivably the remnant here on earth. Christ's Church is a kingdom, and we cannot conceive it otherwise than as organized; it is a body—the Body of Christ—and we cannot conceive it otherwise than as living and performing its functions. The full effect of this idea we do not take in at once; but, if we can receive it, its effect would be very great in obviating our difficulties.

Before we part from Dr. Luckock there is one remark which we should like to make. It has reference to a dangerous phrase to which he has lent some authority. It has been asserted that there are some who have no probation in this life. At least, the phrase has been used. We imagine those who have used it have in view those who are born in circles where Christian influences have never reached, or who are nurtured and live in an atmosphere of wickedness. We think, however, that the phrase is a dangerous one, and tends to diminish the Christian view of the momentous character of this life. It may be true that there are souls which have never had a chance of profiting by Christian influences. But does it follow from this that they have had no probation? Has not God permitted multitudes of heathen to exist, and yet could we say with truth that they have had no probation? The expression, we think, is rash. We know not the secret of each man's individual life. We know not the battle he may have to fight. But we are sure that his life is meted out to him in the Providence of God. Whatever his battle may be, we are sure that he has some battle to fight, and that victory or defeat may be the result. That, we conceive, is his probation, and the consequences of victory or defeat will affect his future. The issues of this present life are, indeed, most momentous.

In L

TH

In a

plac

Peop

nois

thes

who

supp

an a

ther

enga

are s

on it

in fo

Can

ings

and t

figure

to a g

with t

have

As th

'live i

and co

they d

to find

pals in

having

¹ Pe

paper, t

[in the

sender

of post.

sure tha

a total i

It is tru

amount

thus mis

gross inc

(of whic

stated at

ART. XI.—DARKEST ENGLAND.

In Darkest England, and the Way Out. By GENERAL BOOTH.
(London, 1890.)

THE Salvation Army is one of the phenomena of our time. In a few years it is asserted to have grown to an extent that places it amongst the more prosperous sects of the day. People of education and culture may be repelled by the noise and irreverence of its proceedings, but it is evident that these have attractions for numbers of people, and that many who have money at their command contribute liberally to its support. In the appendix at the end of this volume we have an authoritative statement of its present position. We are there told that there are 9,416 officers, or persons wholly engaged in its work, which we suppose to mean that they are supported out of its funds as well as occupied in carrying on its operations; and that more than one-half of these are in foreign countries, amongst which the United States and Canada account for more than a thousand each. The buildings or property vested in the Army are valued at 644,618*l.*, and the annual income at 750,000*l.*¹ These are formidable figures, and it is obvious that such an organization, consisting to a great extent of persons who are alleged to be in touch with the outcast class that it is sought to reclaim, ought to have the best opportunities of ascertaining their real condition. As this book states, the officers of the Salvation Army

'live in the same street, work in the same shops and factories, and come in contact with them at every turn and corner of life. If they don't live amongst them they formerly did. They know where to find them; they are their old chums, pot-house companions, and pals in crime and mischief. . . . They understand their pupils, having been dug out of the same pit. Set a rogue to catch a rogue,

¹ Perhaps it is only fair to quote the following from Mr. Bradlaugh's paper, the *National Reformer*, Nov. 23, 1890:—'As reference was made [in the book *In Darkest England*] to the audited accounts, I wrote to the sender of the book for the current balance-sheet, and received it by return of post. Possibly from some mental incapacity, I am unable to be quite sure that I understand it. The book says that the Salvation Army "has a total income from all sources of three-quarters of a million per annum." It is true that the totals of all the accounts printed in the statements do amount to three-quarters of a million, and Mr. Booth may have been thus misled as to his income; but, excluding borrowed money, the true gross income shown from all sources, including trade, is less than 250,000*l.* (of which the gross trade receipts are 125,438*l.* and the net profit is stated at 12,286*l.*), the borrowed money during the year being 72,854*l.*'

they say—that is, we suppose, a reformed rogue. Any way it is so with us.¹

When, therefore, the chief of such an organization writes a book upon the condition of the people amongst whom his work has been carried on for a quarter of a century, and gives to us the facts concerning them which he has himself noticed, or which have been collected for him by his subordinates, and at the same time elaborates plans for alleviating, if not removing, the evils which have thus been brought to light, it is obvious that we must have before us statements that deserve the most serious and careful examination; and that whether we agree or disagree with the manner in which the Salvation Army carries on its work, whether we accept the account of its great success as given by those responsible for it, or are disposed to be more sceptical concerning it, in consequence of many incumbents in the poorer parts of London asserting that they can find no trace of good effected by it amongst their own parishioners, although the Army has long been at work in their parishes, we are equally bound, from a Christian as well as from a philanthropic point of view, to examine what has been asserted, and to do what we can to remove existing evils that are thus brought before us.

The name of the book has avowedly been derived from the successful one recently published by Mr. Stanley concerning his adventures in the dark continent. It is divided into two distinct portions, the one setting forth the characteristics of 'darkest England'—what is meant by the name, the kinds of people who form its inhabitants and who constitute the degraded mass which justifies the appellation of 'darkest' to any portion of this fair land of ours. The other part of the book describes the remedies proposed, or, as it is termed by the author, 'deliverance.' In addition there is an appendix containing matter from which we have already quoted, and some interesting extracts from other writers that bear upon the subject. To obtain an accurate view of what 'General' Booth holds to be the present state of a considerable portion of our fellow-countrymen, and of his scheme for rescuing them from the degradation in which they are plunged, it is necessary that we should follow his division of the subject.

In examining the earlier portion of his book, containing his diagnosis of the moral diseases of the people in whose behalf he writes, we have great help from the book on *Life and Labour in East London*, which was given to the world the year before last, and was reviewed in the *Church Quarterly* of October 1889,

¹ In *Darkest England*, pp. 244, 245.

and from which 'General' Booth professes to draw his estimate of the 'submerged tenth.' It was written by Mr. Charles Booth—no relation, we believe, to 'General' Booth—who certainly speaks of the condition of the poorest portion of the London population in very much less dismal terms than those employed in the book now under review. Mr. Charles Booth simply describes what he saw and learned of the state of the people, deals largely with statistics drawn from dependable sources which he carefully sets out, keeps his statements within the strictest bounds of definiteness and determination to be accurate, avoids everything that savours of sensationalism, and having no object beyond a simple desire to enable people to have a correct view of the state of the poorer classes, writes like a sympathetic but absolutely dispassionate philanthropist. 'General' Booth, on the other hand, shows throughout that he has an object in view. He desires to impress his readers with a deep and abiding sense of the miseries which he describes, of the pitiable failure of all existing charitable agencies, and of the consequent urgent need of a great and comprehensive scheme to remove existing evils. In this manner he seeks to lead those whose sympathies are touched by the miserable pictures he has drawn, to adopt and further the plans he proposes. We do not, by saying this, desire to suggest that there is the slightest intentional exaggeration, but as we all are influenced, consciously or unconsciously, by the end we have in view, and by a wish to make what we write or say successful in furthering any scheme we have in hand, so no doubt the picture he draws is very much coloured by the feeling that is uppermost in his own mind. Another striking difference between the two writers is that Mr. Charles Booth carefully enumerates all the efforts, religious and philanthropic, that are being made to alleviate the sorrows and improve the condition of the people about whom he writes, and endeavours to say what good he can of all of them, whilst in 'General' Booth's book there is a startling absence of all reference, except in a few depreciatory paragraphs, to the various voluntary agencies that are now at work for promoting the welfare or amendment of the unhappy people whose lot he desires to ameliorate. In fact to read the book without other knowledge of what is being done, the reader would suppose that, beyond a few desultory and disjointed, and consequently weak and ineffectual, philanthropic schemes, the poorer inhabitants of the metropolis are left uncared for, or unthought of, by their more fortunate neighbours. It would be thought that, except so far as they

may be helped by the administrators of Poor Law relief, the destitute population of the metropolis are condemned to utter neglect by all except State paid officials, whilst the assistance rendered by these responsible public officers is given in such a harsh and unsympathetic manner as to make the poorest prefer a state of misery and starvation to receiving help at their hands. 'General' Booth tells us that he has

'many ideas of what might be done with those who are at present cared for in some measure by the State; but I will leave these ideas for the present. It is not urgent that I should explain how our Poor Law system could be reformed, or what I should like to see done for the lunatics in asylums or the criminals in gaols. The in-door paupers, the convicts, the inmates of the lunatic asylums are cared for, in a fashion, already. But, over and above all these, there exists some hundreds of thousands who are not quartered on the State, but who are living on the verge of despair, and who at any moment, under circumstances of misfortune, might be compelled to demand relief or support in one shape or another. I will confine myself, therefore, for the present to those who have no helper' (p. 90).

This helpless mass of starving and miserable humanity he divides into several classes. There are the submerged tenth; the homeless; the out of work; those on the verge of the abyss; the vicious; the criminal; and the children of the lost; to each of whom he devotes a chapter; and as the diagnosis of the diseases from which the patients in the sickly hospital of 'Darkest England' are suffering is important to enable us to judge whether the healing applications proposed are likely to be effectual, it may be well for us to examine what is said of each of these classes separately. Our readers will remember that Mr. Charles Booth divided the labouring population of East London into about the same number of categories, but he labelled them very differently. He took as his standard the amount of money earned by the head of the family, and described the people about whom he was writing¹ as 'the lowest class of occasional labourers, loafers, and semi-criminals; those whose earnings were casual (very poor); those whose earnings were either intermittent or small but regular, whom he speaks of as the poor; those who had regular standard earnings (above the line of poverty); those engaged in higher-class labour; the lower middle class.' From 'General' Booth's description of the persons with whom he is interested, the last five of these classes are wholly omitted. His remarks only apply to those who might be described as forming the lowest class and the very poor.

¹ *Life and Labour*, i. 33.

We
sensatic
build.²

¹ *In L*
² Our
ber 21, 18
Mr. Justice
with two o
in Charles

The very poor as described by Mr. Charles Booth, and the submerged tenth by 'General' Booth may be taken to represent the same class. That our readers may see what they say concerning this class, we will quote the description given of the poorer classes of East London by the two authors just named. In 'General' Booth's book we have statements which remind us of what we read last year in a daily evening newspaper, so that we could imagine the same person the author of both. 'The submerged tenth' are likened to the denizens of the African forests which were recently traversed by Mr. Stanley and his company. We are told that this submerged tenth numbers three millions, and this is the account of them:—

'The equatorial forest traversed by Stanley resembles that Darkest England of which I have to speak, alike in its vast extent—both stretch, in Stanley's phrase, "as far as from Plymouth to Peterhead"—its monotonous darkness, its malaria and its gloom, its dwarfish, dehumanized inhabitants, the slavery to which they are subjected, their privations and their misery. That which sickens the stoutest heart, and causes many of our bravest and best to fold their hands in despair, is the apparent impossibility of doing more than merely to peck at the outside of the endless tangle of monotonous undergrowth. To let light into it, to make a road clear through it that shall not be immediately choked up by the ooze of the morass and the luxuriant parasitical growth of the forest—who dare hope for that? At present, alas! it would seem as though no one dares even to hope! It is the great Slough of Despond of our time. And what a slough it is no man can gauge who has not waded therein, as some of us have done, up to the very neck for long years. Talk about Dante's Hell, and all the horrors and cruelties of the torture chamber of the lost! The man who walks with open eyes and with bleeding heart through the shambles of our civilization needs no such fantastic images of the poet to teach him horror. Often and often, when I have seen the young and the poor and the helpless go down before my eyes into the morass, trampled under foot by beasts of prey in human shape that haunt these regions, it seemed as if God were no longer in His world, but that in His stead reigned a fiend, merciless as hell, ruthless as the grave.'¹

We must confess that this kind of writing seems pure sensationalism, with an insufficient foundation on which to build.² We have had many years' experience of poorest

¹ In *Darkest England*, pp. 12, 13.

² Our faith in it is not increased by seeing in the *Times* of November 21, 1890, that 'General' Booth was mulcted in the sum of 27*l.* in Mr. Justice Smith's Court for untruly asserting that a Mr. Baker 'lodged with two other chaps, not belonging to the "Black Gang," over a rag shop in Charles Street, where they used to introduce girls found in the parks

London, and we can confidently say that we have never seen anything which would justify such a description. Moreover we have for many years taken an active part in rescue work, and nothing has more surprised us than the infrequency of such seduction as is hinted at in the passage we have quoted. Unhappily there has existed a low estimate of the value of purity amongst the poorer classes of the people, and the greater proportion of those wretched women who are on the streets seem to have recklessly thrown themselves there without any persuasion. No doubt there are cases of seducers leading astray young girls, but even in 'General' Booth's summary of the women in his rescue homes this only amounts to one in three of the unfortunate women with whom he came in contact, and certainly does not justify the insinuation thrown out in the paragraph just quoted.

It is a relief to turn from this flight of imagination to the more prosaic, but, we believe, more truthful, account of the same class as depicted by Mr. Charles Booth. It is very sad, but to estimate it aright we must remember the number of ne'er-do-weels in every class of life. He writes—

'The state of things which I describe in these pages, though not so appalling as sensational writers would have us believe, is still bad enough to make us feel that we ought not to tolerate it in our midst, if we can think of any feasible remedy. To effectually deal with this class of the very poor—for the State to nurse the helpless and in-

tilt it got too much for the landlord;' and also, in the *Times* of January 22, 1891, a letter signed by Colonel Smith, chief commissioner of the City police, saying, 'In a letter addressed to your Lordship' (the Lord Mayor), 'and published in the *Times* of yesterday, "General" Booth asserts that one night last week "his officers found on one of the Thames bridges no less than 164 persons, of various ages, without any sort of shelter or protection from the weather other than that provided by the parapets surrounding the recesses of the footpaths," and that "most of these poor creatures remained all night." As your Lordship has seen in the *Times* of this morning, Blackfriars is the bridge indicated. Having been instructed to report upon the accuracy of this statement, I can only confirm what I said last night, that there is not a word of truth in "General" Booth's allegations. Strict orders are always in force that no one is to be allowed to remain all night on any of the bridges within the jurisdiction of the City police; and during the recent inclement weather special instructions have been issued on the subject to prevent people—apparently homeless—from loitering or falling asleep. I need hardly point out to your Lordship that had such a state of things been allowed to exist on Blackfriars Bridge numerous cases of sudden and serious illness, possibly of death, would have been the inevitable result. Not one case that even by a stretch of the most vivid imagination could be attributed to exposure on the bridge has been taken to Bridewell police station since the beginning of December. I have not had time to search further back. The whole story is absolutely untrue from beginning to end.'

con-
sick-
then
than
tion
cert
peop
than
the
that
or w
If th
are
State
com
prod
orga
that
is as
only
other
woul
man
to co
tract
idle
regul
many
who
viciss

If we
would
the di
a regu

H
ill-pa
contr

'P
be allo
land a
and w
to nigh
accour
the lan
that, in

competent, as we in our families nurse the old, the young, and the sick, and provide for those who are not competent to provide for themselves—may seem an impossible undertaking, but nothing less than this will enable self-respecting labour to obtain its full remuneration and the nation its raised standard of life. The difficulties, which certainly are great, do not lie in the cost. As it is, these unfortunate people cost the community, one way or another, considerably more than they contribute. I do not refer solely to the fact that they cost the State more than they pay directly or indirectly in taxes. I mean that altogether, ill paid and half starved as they are, they consume, or waste, or have expended on them, more wealth than they create. If they were ruled out we should be much better off than we now are; and if this class were under State tutelage—say at once under State slavery—the balance sheet would be more favourable to the community. They would consume more, but the amount they produced would be increased in greater proportion by State organization of their labour and their lives. It is not in the cost that the difficulty lies, but in the question of individual liberty, for it is as free men and not as slaves that we must deal with them. The only form compulsion could assume would be that of making life otherwise impossible, an enforcement of the standard of life which would oblige every one of us to accept the relief of the State in the manner prescribed by the State, unless we were able and willing to conform to this standard. The life offered would not be attractive. Some might be glad to exchange their half-fed and half-idle and wholly unregulated life for a disciplined existence, with regular meals and fixed hours of work (which would not be short); many even might be willing to try it; but there would be few who would not tire of it, and long for the old life of hardship and vicissitude, saying—

“Give me again my hollow tree,
A crust of bread, and liberty.”

If we could adopt this plan there is no cause for fearing that it would encourage idleness or weaken the springs of energy. No! the difficulty lies solely in inducing or driving these people to accept a regulated life.¹

He therefore proposes to bring this class of incompetent, ill-paid, under-fed people under State regulation, and so to control the springs of pauperism.

‘Put practically, but shortly, my idea is that these people should be allowed to live as families in industrial groups, planted wherever land and building materials were cheap, being well housed, well fed, and well warmed, and taught, trained, and employed from morning to night on work, indoors or out, for themselves or on Government account, in the building of their own dwellings, in the cultivation of the land, in the making of clothes, or in the making of furniture; that, in exchange for the work done, the Government should supply

¹ *Life and Labour*, pp. 165, 166.

materials and whatever else was needed. On this footing it is probable that the State would find the work done very dear, and by so much would lose. How much the loss would be could only be told by trying the system experimentally. There would be no competition with the outside world. It would be merely that the State, having these people on its hands, obtained whatever value it could out of their work. They would become servants of the State . . . It would, moreover, be necessary to set a limit to the current deficiency submitted to by the State, and when the account of any family reached this point to move them on to the poorhouse, where they would live as a family no longer. The socialistic side of life as it is includes the poorhouse and the prison, and the whole system, as I conceive it, would provide within itself motives in favour of prudence and a sufficient pressure to stimulate industry. Nor would hope be wanting to those who were ambitious to face the world again.¹

Beside this proposed scheme of Mr. Charles Booth's it is only fair to call attention to what has been done by the Church Army under the Rev. W. Carlile. In a circular dated December 22, 1890, and signed by the secretaries of that Army, it is stated that 'twelve months ago they were the first to introduce an adaptation of the German Labour Home Colony System, which is based on personal religious influence; that they 'were also the first to propose the Farm and Over-Sea Colony as supplementary to the City Labour Home Colonies, and that they hope soon to have the Farm and Over-Sea Colonies in operation; that by confederation with already existing agencies their social scheme is equally comprehensive in covering the whole ground, and by hearty co-operation hypocrisy will be detected and waste avoided by one not overlapping another's work.' Beside this claim to priority of proposal they give other reasons for reposing faith in their proposals, and amongst them is the assertion of the considerable success that has already attended upon their labours.

It is a little hard upon those who have already done so much, to have their scheme plagiarized by another, and without the slightest reference to what they have done, and to see their own plans dressed up in sensational forms by a writer skilled in writing of that character, and attracting attention and liberal contributions, whilst the earlier workers are comparatively neglected. And as a matter of fact this is apparently what has happened.

'General' Booth has adopted the plan sketched out by Mr. Charles Booth, and actually commenced by the Church Army, and he proposes to carry out by voluntary agency that which his namesake thinks could only be done effectually by

¹ *Life and Labour*, pp. 167, 168.

the State, but which the Church Army is about to try on the lines he is following. We doubt whether it could be done successfully, to anything like the extent 'General' Booth suggests by what he says in his book, for any length of time by either the one or the other of the ways named, though we have no doubt that it would be productive of much good to individuals. In a despotic country, where there was no free press, no members of Parliament delighting to question responsible public servants, and to find fault with all that they did, where the prison or the knout could be applied *ad libitum*, it is possible that such a mode of providing for the incompetent, the idle, and the whole class of ne'er-do-weels, might be successful. But where compulsion of the kind is absolutely impossible we are satisfied that eventual failure is inevitable in the case of a majority of those for whose good the proposal is made. For a time, such a plan, voluntarily managed, might attract a number of persons under the pressure of extreme want; but we fear that a majority of them would soon tire and leave. Of this 'General' Booth evidently has fears, and the City Colony and the Over-Sea Colony are no doubt intended for drafting off those unfitted for the Farm Colony. We fear that our remarks would apply to these alternatives also. And if this should prove to be the case, what becomes of the plan which is to deliver the whole class whom 'General' Booth proposes to raise to a higher moral and social condition?

The next chapter in 'General' Booth's book deals with the 'out-of-works.' Here, so far from its being represented that the people are the wretched, miserable beings described in the quotation we gave from the same authority, or as at all resembling the incompetent mass of whom Mr. Charles Booth speaks, they are put before us as objects of pity, who would work if they had the opportunity. Here, too, we come across one of the misrepresentations of which we complain; for the following passage is obviously unjust to existing philanthropic efforts, more particularly if the plagiarism to which we have called attention is remembered:—

'Most schemes that are put forward for the improvement of the circumstances of the people are either avowedly or actually limited to those whose condition least needs amelioration. The Utopians, the economists, and most of the philanthropists propound remedies which, if adopted to-morrow, would only affect the aristocracy of the miserable. It is the thrifty, the industrious, the sober, the thoughtful who can take advantage of these plans; but the thrifty, the industrious, the sober, and the thoughtful are already very well

able, for the most part, to take care of themselves. No one will ever make even a visible dint on the morass of squalor who does not deal with the improvident, the lazy, the vicious, and the criminal.' ¹

So far as our experience goes, this is an accepted truth by all who are labouring in the field of philanthropy. The superior class described in the above quotation need no helpers, for the road to success is always open before them, and probably there never was a time when more men raised themselves to a position superior to that to which they were born than the present. But what is said, and truly said, is that you cannot help those who will not try to help themselves, which is very different to what 'General' Booth asserts that people accept as their principle of action.

It would obviously not be correct to speak of any of the classes, whose unfortunate condition 'General' Booth has sketched as 'dwarfish and dehumanized, as being subjected to slavery,' though we admit that they have to endure much misery and many privations. We press forward, therefore, to the remaining chapters, in which we expect to be told about the three millions who constitute 'the submerged tenth.' Again we are doomed to find much said about people who are in dangerous and pitiable positions, such as those who are 'on the verge of the abyss and the children of the lost,' and but little about the millions in whose behalf the appeal is professedly made. As a matter of fact there are only two classes, 'the vicious and the criminal,' who answer to what we were led to expect by the graphic description of the awful array which 'General' Booth paraded before us. And even from these two degraded classes we are assured that many a brand may be plucked from the burning, and in this there is no doubt truth. What strikes us most as we carefully read over the chapters that are designed to describe the hosts that need to be succoured is that they seem carefully drawn up to move the sympathies of those who can afford to contribute liberally to a great philanthropic experiment, rather than to give an accurate picture of the poorer and more degraded classes to be found in great towns such as London. There is, however, one paragraph in the chapter on the children of the lost that seems to us well worth quoting, coming as it does from such a man as the writer whose work we are considering :

'But, it will be said, the child of to-day has the inestimable advantage of education. No, he has not. Educated the children are not. They are pressed through "standards" which exact a certain acquaintance with A B C and pothooks and figures, but educated

¹ *In Darkest England*, pp. 35, 36.

they are not, in the sense of the development of their latent capacities, so as to make them capable for the discharge of their duties in life. The new generation can read, no doubt. Otherwise where would be the sale of "Sixteen-String Jack," "Dick Turpin," and the like? But take the girls. Who can pretend that the girls whom our schools are turning out are half as well educated for the work of life as their grandmothers were at the same age? How many of all these mothers of the future know how to bake a loaf or wash their clothes? Except minding the baby—a task that cannot be evaded—what domestic training have they received to qualify them for being in the future the mothers of babies themselves? And even the schooling, such as it is, at what an expense is it often imparted! The rakings of the human cesspool are brought into the schoolroom and mixed with your children. Your little ones, who never heard a foul word, and who are not only innocent, but ignorant, of all the horrors of vice and sin, sit for hours side by side with little ones whose parents are habitually drunk, and play with others whose ideas of merriment are gained from the familiar spectacle of the nightly debauch by which their mothers earn the family bread.¹

We turn from the description of *Darkest England* to the deliverance proposed. This he prefaces with the question, 'Is there no help?' In every chapter he gives examples to show that whilst others fail, he succeeds. He seems to assume this to be necessary in order to justify his demand for a million of money to give his scheme a fair chance of getting into practical operation, and 30,000*l.* a year to sustain it.² For it cannot be expected that people will contribute such large sums unless evidence is furnished sufficient to convince them that it will secure the desired end. He commences by depreciating what is done under the direction of the State, and insists that the poor laws, the casual wards, the gaols are failures, for they do not accomplish what they might do and ought to do. More than one writer has contradicted the assertions respecting the hardships to which the occupants of union workhouses and casual wards are subjected; whilst the assertion³ that 'every prison is more or less a training school for crime, an introduction to the society of criminals, the petrification of any lingering human feeling, and a very Bastille of despair' seems to us a very exaggerated statement, whilst reformatories and industrial schools, which are well reported of by all who know them, are never mentioned, and yet last year they had more than 28,000 inmates. Emigration as now conducted is thus described:—

'You might as well lay a new-born child in the middle of a new-sown

¹ *In Darkest England*, p. 63.

³ *Ibid.* pp. 73, 74.

² *Ibid.* p. 246.

field in March, and expect it to live and thrive, as expect emigration to produce successful results on the lines which some lay down. . . . It is simply criminal to take a multitude of untrained men and women and land them penniless and helpless on the fringe of some new continent. The result of such proceedings we see in the American cities, in the degradation of their slums, and in the hopeless demoralization of thousands who in their own country were living decent, industrious lives.¹

Nor are the efforts of private philanthropy treated with more respect.

'The method in which society endeavours to do its duty to the lapsed masses is by miscellaneous and heterogeneous efforts which are clubbed together under the generic head of charity. Far be it from me to say one word in disparagement of any effort that is prompted by a sincere desire to alleviate the misery of our fellow-creatures ; but the most charitable are those who most deplore the utter failure which has, up till now, attended all their efforts to do more than temporarily alleviate pain, or effect an occasional improvement in the condition of individuals. There are many institutions, very excellent in their way, without which it is difficult to see how society could get on at all ; but when they have done their best, there still remains this great and appalling mass of human misery on our hands, a perfect quagmire of human sludge. They may ladle out individuals here and there, but to drain the whole bog is an effort which seems to be beyond the imagination of most of those who spend their lives in philanthropic work. It is no doubt better than nothing to take the individual and feed him from day to day, to bandage up his wounds and heal his diseases ; but you may go on doing that for ever if you do not do more than that. And the worst of it is that all authorities agree that if you only do that, you will probably increase the evil with which you are attempting to deal, and that you had much better let the whole thing alone.'²

We never read a more complete jumble of the true and the false. It is quite true that the more earnest and thorough people are in their efforts to amend the state of things around them, the more conscious they become of the very partial success they are permitted to achieve ; just as the more holy people become, the more deeply they feel their own unworthiness and imperfections, so that St. Paul described himself as 'the chief of sinners.'³ The same feeling is aroused when the benevolent open and support hospitals, or orphanages, or penitentiaries, or any other institution for alleviating sorrow and misery. They help, it may be, hundreds or even thousands, but they likewise are unable to aid all who seek to them for help, and they fail to raise those they assist so much as they

¹ *In Darkest England*, p. 75. ² *Ibid.* pp. 72, 73. ³ 1 Tim. i. 15.

desire. Are their efforts, therefore, to be accounted an 'utter failure'? Then, if people are not to be helped one by one, how are they to be helped? How did Christ the Lord help them? Did He gather them to Himself one by one, or did He insist upon the moral and spiritual condition of the whole world being changed by one great scheme? Surely He invited all to come to Him, but each one had to come by himself. The sick were not cured by hundreds at a time; all the blind people in Judæa were not restored to sight by a single exercise of power; every devil was not driven out of those possessed, by the sovereign exercise of that authority which He possessed. And if the Master was content to work upon individuals, can the servants expect to do more than He did? Are they to imagine that they will be able to drive away evils by a cunningly devised scheme of temporal help which He never thought of practising? And yet this is what 'General' Booth claims to be able to do. If he only succeeds in rescuing a comparatively few individuals, he will only do what thousands have done before him. If he fails to regenerate the whole lowest stratum of society in England, his scheme must be regarded as a failure if it is to be judged by the standard he himself has proposed, and upon faith in which, he is receiving large sums of money from those who believe that he can accomplish what he has led them to expect that he will do.

Let us now turn to the scheme by which this regeneration of England is to be effected. It is to be accomplished mainly by three great institutions, (1) the City Colony, (2) the Farm Colony, (3) the Over-Sea Colony—in other words, by providing workshops, or what is called a labour bureau, to which those who are out of work may go, assured that they will immediately find food and shelter and kindly sympathy from those who are in charge of the undertaking. He then expects that a number of these people, after a certain probation, will be drafted off into the country, and there be set to labour in manners suitable to their capacity; and, after a further probation those of them who are fitted for the change will be sent out in batches to the colonies, where they will find themselves surrounded by friends instead of by strangers, and where they will be assisted over the trying time of the first year of their sojourn in a strange land.

There is much that is good in these proposals, much that has commended itself to other philanthropists. There is no part of the scheme that has not been tried; but it has been done in parts and not as one whole, and in this there is no doubt some advantage. The strict military discipline that

'General' Booth enforces in the Salvation Army will no doubt be a material help. Many a poor creature that cannot be moved by gentleness and persuasion, will instinctively bow before the stern commands of a man of strong will and determined purpose. The question is what effect will it have upon those who are made of sterner stuff—the wilful, the headstrong, the habitual loiterers and idlers? They will soon quarrel with the discipline; and what is to happen then? Are they to be expelled? If so, in what is this scheme better than others? Are they to be detained? If so, who is to assume the responsibility, before the law, of virtually imprisoning them against their will? Whilst speaking of this portion of the scheme, it is only fair to add that we cannot help admiring the way in which the proposer of this method of alleviating distress contrives to make those who take advantage of his labour bureau earn sufficient to defray the expense incurred on their behalf at the dépôts or shelters. At the food dépôts 'there is no gratuitous distribution of victuals.'¹

'You come along to one of our shelters. On entering you pay fourpence and are free of the establishment for the night. We find that we can provide coffee, and bread for breakfast and for supper, and a shake-down on the floor in the packing-boxes I have described, in a warm dormitory for fourpence a head.'²

Then again with the factory:—

'Let me introduce you to our labour yard. Here is no pretence of charity beyond the charity which gives a man remunerative labour. It is not our business to pay men wages. What we propose is to enable those, male or female, who are destitute, to earn their rations and do enough work to pay for their lodging, until they are able to go out into the world and earn wages for themselves. There is no compulsion upon anyone to resort to our shelter, but if a penniless man wants food he must, as a rule, do work sufficient to pay for what he has of that and of other accommodation. I say as a rule, because, of course, our officers will be allowed to make exceptions in extreme cases, but the rule will be, first work, then eat; and that amount of work will be exacted rigorously. It is that which distinguishes this scheme from mere charitable relief.'³

'Our industrial factory at Whitechapel was established this spring. We opened it on a very small scale. It has developed until we have nearly ninety men at work. Some of these are skilled workmen, who are engaged in carpentry. The particular job they have now in hand is the making of benches for the Salvation Army. Others are engaged in mat-making, some are cobblers, others painters, and so forth. This trial effort has so far answered admirably. No one who is taken

¹ *In Darkest England*, p. 96.

² *Ibid.* pp. 99, 100.

³ *Ibid.* pp. 106, 107.

on comes for a permanency. So long as he is willing to work for his rations, he is supplied with materials and provided with skilled superintendents. The hours of work are eight per day.¹

These seem promising expedients for helping those who need help. But then, why is there no mention of the food depôts that have been worked successfully in various parts of London by the sisters of the Church? Why are the labour yards of the Church Army not spoken of, though they have been in existence longer than those of 'General' Booth? Then again, expedients of this kind are necessarily limited in the amount of good they can do. The difficulty of finding a market for the work executed is great when the domestic market, which 'General' Booth starts with, is exhausted. Nor must it be forgotten that skilled labourers outside would soon make their voices heard, if work done at this economical rate of payment should deprive them of the occupation or wages to which they have been accustomed. From all we hear, this labour yard of 'General' Booth's is admirably managed, and the men seen at work there appear to be well satisfied; but it must be remembered that novelties generally please; it is continuance at work of the kind that is the trying part of it. And, though it is proposed that the same men shall not continue for any length of time in the labour yard, the institution will remain; murmurings will be heard, discontent will spread—nay, it is certain that difficulties will arise which will make this excellent project less successful than its first promise might have led us to hope.

This is no prophecy. We fear that trouble has already begun; for we gather from what has appeared in the newspapers that difficulties have already arisen in this labour department. Its success must necessarily depend on the skill and devotion of the person placed in charge, and the first superintendent appears to have had the qualifications needed to secure success. The organization of this social scheme has been in charge of Mr. Frank Smith; but, upon his insisting that the funds given for this portion of the Salvation Army work should be kept absolutely distinct from what is contributed for the furtherance of their evangelising efforts, he has been so unsatisfactorily met at head-quarters that he has felt compelled to resign. This refusal may have arisen from circumstances with which we are imperfectly acquainted, or the moving cause may have been the fear of a rival, which is natural in the head of such a society as the Salvation Army; but it remains to be seen whether the removal of the chief

¹ *In Darkest England*, p. 107.

organizer of the industrial factory may not seriously militate against its success.

To supplement this factory scheme it is proposed to open a labour bureau, where employers can register their needs, and by means of which those needs may be supplied. For such a bureau to succeed it would seem that two things are essential—that it should be able to vouch for the character and skill of the persons recommended. From the very nature of the case this would not be practicable with the persons for whose benefit the bureau is intended. It is not the steady, sober, skilful men who will seek the assistance of the shelters and the labour factory, but those of the very opposite description. Nor are we in a country where there is a dearth of labour, and where there would consequently be a chance for men of doubtful character or qualifications to obtain employment. Our difficulties arise to a considerable extent from the excess of persons seeking employment. There is not enough for all, and therefore, unhappily, the weak ones have to go to the wall. The figures given by 'General' Booth prove the little that his establishment can hope to effect. Such a bureau has been in operation for three months, during which there were 2,670 applications for work and 187 applications from employers. With the considerable *clientèle* of the Salvation Army we are surprised that this last number should be so very small.

Then, to manage these town works economically and to help the country farm project, there appears the oft-tried plan of collecting broken meat, and such like, from the houses of upper-class people. We imagine that this plan is capable of very little extension. There are already many agencies at work to do the same thing, and people of moderate means generally try to make the most of all that they purchase. The happy hunting ground for success in this field is practically limited to hotels and the houses of the very wealthy; and even in their case it must furnish a considerable temptation to the servants to be wasteful.

The second great project is the country farm. Here there is to be spade husbandry, gardening, building of cottages, and all that is needed for farm operations. The bricks are to be made out of clay on the land, the building and carpentering are to be executed by artisans sent down from the London labour factory; furniture, clothing, and whatever is needed to supply the necessities or comfort of those for whom the benevolent scheme is responsible, are to be manufactured by persons on the estate. Fruit farming is to be carried on, and

no.
po
und
have
'Ge
this
deve

shel
out
whe
train
insp
and
vari
othe
at la
plish
to d
a ca
a ye

I
of th
disli
any
haun
to w
farm
adri
state
clean
can
the S
own
acco
whic
whils
are t
gove

withi
expel
disho
offen
incur

no doubt an extensive jam factory improvised. Rabbits, poultry, bees are to add their stores to the success of the undertaking. We have heard of such efforts before, but we have yet to hear of their prospering, and it is quite clear that 'General' Booth has much less acquaintance with work of this kind than he has with that to which he has hitherto devoted himself.

After being passed through the two sieves of the home shelters or factory and the farm, the promising are to be sent out as colonists. They are to go to places prepared for them, where they will be surrounded with those who have been trained in the same school, and where all are expected to be inspired with a noble 'ambition to do well for themselves and their fellow-colonists,' after having been trained in the various ways that seem to secure complete success. In other words, it will be found that Utopia has been discovered at last; and what the Church of Christ has failed to accomplish in nearly nineteen centuries 'General' Booth promises to do in a few years, if only people will provide for him a capital of a million of money and an income of 30,000*l.* a year.

It is natural here to ask the question, What is to become of those who tire of the restraint imposed upon them, who dislike work and will never be persuaded to persevere with any task? with those who insist upon returning to their old haunts, and who prefer starvation one day, and rioting another, to what may seem to them the dull monotony of a life in the farm colony, or in that over-sea? If they are to be turned adrift and allowed to resume their old habits, we have the old state of things over again. This Mr. Charles Booth sees clearly, and therefore insists that such a plan as that proposed can only be successful when it has the compulsory forces of the State behind it. 'General' Booth is so confident of his own powers that he seems to entertain no doubt that he can accomplish what the Saviour of the world and the Church which He founded have not yet succeeded in doing; and yet whilst this spirit of self-confidence pervades the book there are the following rules and regulations set down for the government of the colonists:—

'The use of intoxicants strictly prohibited, none being allowed within its borders. Any colonist guilty of violating this order to be expelled, and that on the first offence.' 'Expulsion for drunkenness, dishonesty, or falsehood will follow the third offence.' 'Serious offenders against the virtue of women, or of children of either sex, to incur immediate expulsion.' 'After a certain period of probation

and a considerable amount of patience all who will not work to be expelled.'¹

We fear that another scheme would soon be needed to look after those expelled by 'General' Booth, and that the great majority of those received by him would drift into what it could provide.

All sorts of other benevolent projects are suggested. Whatever 'General' Booth has heard of other philanthropists doing for the good of their kind, he proposes to include in his grand scheme for the regeneration of mankind. A slum crusade, a travelling hospital, a prison-gate brigade, a home for delivering drunkards from their besetting vice, rescue homes, a preventive house for unfallen girls when in danger, an enquiry office for lost people, refuges for children of the street, industrial schools, asylums for moral lunatics, improved lodgings, model suburban villages, a poor man's bank, a poor man's lawyer, an intelligence department, a matrimonial bureau, sanatoriums by the sea—all these he is prepared to set on foot and be responsible for, if only the wealthy will pour out their riches at his feet, and enable him to start them at their expense.

And here we naturally ask, What are the credentials on which he relies to tempt us to entrust him with our money? This is an advertising age, a self-asserting age, a boasting age, a self-confident age; and that being so the presumption is that there must be many who are content to believe what the self-confident advertisers say of themselves. We do not number ourselves amongst the number. We want evidence that we can sift, proofs that we can rely upon, something more than assertions. We turn, therefore, first of all to the evidence which the writer of the book has thought it desirable to give, and it may be well to look a little closely at it.

First of all he tells us what has been done, that readers may be inspired with the hope that what has been accomplished on a small scale for individuals with existing machinery may be accomplished on an infinitely extended scale if that machinery is proportionately increased. We have, under the heading 'Some Shelter Trophies,' accounts of twelve persons who have been rescued from lives of sin and misery. In each case we have romantic histories of what they had undergone in the past, and how they were reduced to the miserable plight which led them to seek refuge in the 'shelters.' No doubt these stories are sub-

¹ In *Darkest England*, pp. 137, 138.

stant
chang

'A

Clerk
been

chapel

1889.

(Buff)

stood

seems

God

cast, w

good s

judge s

accomp

custom

Saved

reliable

don to

years a

drink.

Four m

able me

was pas

day the

played,

of neigh

upon G

was obta

ness in a

prosper

all associ

We

to give

to have

stantial

two poi

date of

above t

1889, an

strict dis

are conv

given.

some go

tion is th

ments in

stantially true. What we want, however, is evidence of the change that is effected in them. This is given as follows:—

'A. B.: Saved at Clerkenwell, May 19, 1889. W. M.: Saved at Clerkenwell, March 31, 1889. His character since conversion has been altogether satisfactory, and he is now an orderly at Whitechapel, and to all appearances "a true lad." C. W.: Saved April 24, 1889. He was met on his release at Millbank by an old chum (Buff) and the shelter captain; came to shelter, got saved, and has stood firm. H. A.: Saved at Clerkenwell, January 12, 1889. He seems honest in his profession, and strives patiently to follow after God. He is at the workshops. H. S.: He came to us an utter outcast, was sent to shelter and workshop, got saved, and is now in a good situation. He gives every promise, and those best able to judge seem very sanguine that at last a real good work has been accomplished in him. F. D.: Came to Whitechapel, became a regular customer, eight months ago got saved, and is now doing well. F. H.: Saved at Whitechapel, March 26, 1890. He is now a trustworthy, reliable lad; has become reconciled to his wife, who came to London to see him, and he bids fair to be a useful man. J. W. S.: Two years ago he came to London, fell into evil courses, and took to drink. He found out Westminster shelter, and eventually got saved. Four months standing, and is a promising soldier as well as a respectable mechanic. J. T., after being at the shelter some time, got saved, was passed to workshops, and gave great satisfaction. J. S.: To-day they (he and his wife) have a good time; he is steadily employed, and both are serving God, holding the respect and confidence of neighbours, &c. E. G. was lovingly invited to cast his care upon God, and eventually he was converted. After some time work was obtained as porter in a City warehouse. Assiduity and faithfulness in a year raised him to the position of traveller. To-day he prospers in body and soul, retaining the respect and confidence of all associated with him.'

We thought it best, even at the risk of being tedious, to give one complete set of sample cases of the good claimed to have been effected. Those under other heads are substantially like the above. In looking carefully at the list, two points are specially observable. The first is the recent date of the complete change. Out of the twelve named above there is only one which is of longer standing than 1889, and of those recovered, nearly all remain under the strict discipline of the army; and of course of those who are converted and after a short time fall away, no account is given. That some are reclaimed we do not doubt; that some good is effected we sincerely hope. What we question is the amount of abiding good secured, and the statements in the book suggest no grounds of confidence on this

¹ *In Darkest England*, pp. 102-104.

head. The other point is, that in each case the restored sinner is described as 'saved,' or as having found salvation. What the value of this may be is a matter about which opinions will widely differ; and upon people's judgment concerning it will depend to a great extent the value they place upon the work of the Salvation Army, and the proposals now set forth by 'General' Booth. For our own part, we must say candidly that we have no confidence whatever in what is spoken of as 'finding salvation' or 'being saved.' That in some minds the principle of faith is planted under such teaching as that given by the Salvation Army is confidently affirmed, and we are not in a position to deny it; but that in great numbers of those who profess to have undergone the change, no real change is visible, is vouched for by so many outside witnesses that we cannot doubt it. Continuance in well-doing is the test, the possession of a faith that leads men to resist temptation, and to live righteously, is the only proof that can convince. Excitement, the sympathy of kindly people, the persuasions of those who profess to have 'found peace,' the atmosphere of noise, and religious profession, and jubilant rejoicing, which seems to pervade what Salvationists say, the comfortable doctrine that all is right when a man can convince himself that his sins are forgiven, and that he is a pardoned child of God, easily lead a man to feel at peace with himself, and when he so feels he is assured that he has 'found salvation.' It is only to be expected that such influences should, for the most part, lead to a change that resembles 'the morning cloud and the early dew,' and not to any thorough conversion of heart and life. It will be well to notice that in every case set forth in this book, such a change as that just described is the main voucher for the reality of the reformation which is claimed to have been effected. This has to be borne in mind in considering the great philanthropic scheme propounded, as that is in some places spoken of as independent of the religious system of the Salvation Army; and to this we shall have to call attention.

It may be well to quote here from a letter that appeared in the *Times* of March 11 last from the Rev. J. Mahomed, chaplain of the London Hospital. Starting with a bias in favour of 'General' Booth's scheme, he examined it closely. He found

'that in the really poor parts of East London the Salvation Army was, up to six months before the date of this return, entirely unrepresented, apart from the shelter, in Whitechapel. There are no

189
bar
Bet
the
are
170,
distr
atter
faile
not t
any
and
betw
soldie
East
years'
barrac
W
succes
which
ties o
scorn
achiev
claim,
by 'G
reform
change
good w
that th
or mon
And
dence o
it is pro
'The
ing with
tion of be
some of i
of the fe
our ranks
'We pro
to the diff
Cross, and
women mu
This app
from the
lected. I

barracks, no slum sisters, no outposts in Spitalfields, in South Bethnal Green, in St. George's-in-the-East, or in Whitechapel. All the districts of East London where the Salvation Army has agents are of the better class, such as Hackney, with its population of 170,000, including Clapton. As far as the really poor and crowded districts of East London are concerned, the Salvation Army has attempted to get a footing during the last ten or twelve years, has failed, and has retired. I conclude, therefore, that Mr. Booth has not the first essential condition of success claimed by himself, viz. any moral power over "the submerged tenth." Taking the first and second columns of the return, I notice the great difference between the number of the annual conversions and the number of soldiers permanently enrolled. In Hackney—the strongest regiment in East London—there are 232 annual conversions, and after several years' work only 100 are permanently connected with the Hackney barracks.¹

We should like, further, to ask, In what do the cases of success to which we have called attention differ from those which are equally claimed by the many philanthropic societies on whose labours *In Darkest England* pours so much scorn? They would probably describe the results they had achieved in somewhat different terms, but those terms would claim, from us at least, as much confidence as those employed by 'General' Booth. To hear of the vicious and profligate reformed, and that reform evidenced by many years of changed life, would convey to us a greater assurance that a good work in them had been accomplished, than to be told that they had been 'saved,' or 'found salvation,' a few weeks or months since.

Another claim made by 'General' Booth for the confidence of the public, is the exceptionally able manner in which it is proposed to deal with particular classes of sinners.

'The Salvation Army has at least one great qualification for dealing with discharged prisoners. I believe I am in the proud position of being at the head of the only religious body which has always some of its members in gaol for conscience sake. We are also one of the few bodies which can boast that many of those who are in our ranks have gone through terms of penal servitude.'¹

'We propose the opening of homes for this class as near as possible to the different gaols. One for men has just been taken at King's Cross, and will be occupied as soon as it can be got ready. One for women must follow immediately.'²

This appears an excellent object, and one that would seem, from the wording of the book, to have been hitherto neglected. If such has been the impression upon anyone's mind

¹ *In Darkest England*, p. 174.

² *Ibid.* p. 175.

he will have been undeceived by a letter of the Duke of Westminster which appeared in the *Times* of December 11. He tells us that

'in 1857 a society was established for helping prisoners discharged from penal servitude. In 1878 a uniform system has been applied in all localities, and the formation of aid societies has been so much encouraged that there are now sixty-three discharged prisoners' aid societies, working in connexion with all prisons in England and Wales except one or two, besides forty-two other societies, refuges, and homes. In London itself no less than fifteen societies are engaged in the work, and every prisoner on discharge has an opportunity of being assisted by one or other of them.'

All, therefore, that 'General' Booth can do is to start a scheme for which there is no need, and to do harm rather than good by unnecessarily multiplying agencies.

In like manner we believe it would be easy to show that every really philanthropic object proposed by 'General' Booth is being ably and earnestly cared for. His scheme, as we have already stated, differs from other similar ones only in this: that he proposes to bring all these benevolent agencies under one control, to place himself at the head of an universal scheme of benevolence that is to be fed by the wealthy placing their riches at his disposal, whilst from all share in the management or direction of what is to be done, they are to be rigorously excluded. Such a result would seem to us to be most unfortunate, if it could be attained. Personal ministrations to the poor open men's hearts and sympathies, and nothing is more to be deprecated than placing them in the hands of an autocrat, whose sovereign decrees are to be carried out by an army of paid servants, who, however earnest and single-minded they may be, are in that position of life that to dismiss them from the service would be to deprive them of the employment on which they depend for their daily bread. Moreover what is required for the success of most of the plans proposed by 'General' Booth is the concentrated attention of a really competent person. It is quite certain that, however able he may be, it would be impossible for him to do more than select agents possessing the necessary ability and devotion to the work. It is, therefore, pertinent to the subject to enquire whether he has hitherto evinced that insight into character which would enable us to repose undoubting confidence in his power of selecting the best qualified persons for undertaking the many responsible offices which the carrying out of his plans must create. Under any circumstances it would

seem more probable that a more happy choice of the best persons to carry on benevolent works, such as those proposed, would be made when each superintendent was the responsible chief, and not a mere deputy to an absent superior, whose personal knowledge of details, and consequent power of deciding wisely, must necessarily be very limited.

But, if we can trust the statements in an ex-captain's experience of the Salvation Army, it would seem that in 'General' Booth's opinion family ties constitute the strongest claim to the high places of the service. There it is said—

'The Salvation Army is open to the remark that it is emphatically a family concern. Mr. Booth, senior, is general; one son is "chief of the staff," and the remaining sons and daughters engross the other chief positions. It is Booth all over; indeed, like the sun in your eyes, you can see nothing else wherever you turn. Even the married daughters retain the illustrious name before that of their husbands, who themselves adopt it. The most sounding titles have been appropriated by the illustrious household. One daughter is "the Maréchale;" another is the head of the "Indian missions," as joint apostle with her husband beyond the Indus. Mr. Bramwell Booth figures as "chief of the staff," ruling as such over all peoples, nations, and languages, Nebuchadnezzar-like, so far as they are connected with the Salvation Army. Nor does it seem too much to say of the officers of the Army that they tremble and fear before him. . . . Another son is head of the Army in America, and the third seems to rule in the great "Training Home" at Clapton' (pp. viii, ix).

Full as the newspapers have been of correspondence about the book now under review, we have never seen this account of the officering of the Army challenged; it must therefore be assumed to be correct.

We are not disposed to examine more closely the details of the scheme, many of which have been ably handled by Mr. Loch, the secretary of the Charity Organization Society, Professor Huxley, the late Dean of Wells, and others, in the columns of the *Times*, whilst, in addition to these criticisms, the Rev. H. Webb Peplow, who was for a time much disposed to countenance 'General' Booth's proposal, tells us that he has been compelled to withdraw his consent, because he is not satisfied with the manner in which the money contributed is held, and with the proposed method for keeping separate, what is given for the philanthropic scheme, and for the religious objects of the Salvation Army. Our object has been to describe what the scheme is, and the fundamental objections to its main provisions or manner of working, and only to speak of details when required to illustrate the principle under

discussion. There is, however, one most important point to which we have still to call attention. And we have kept to the last our strongest ground for distrusting the proposals contained in this book, and that lies in our utter disbelief in the religious teaching of the Salvation Army. It seems to us something quite different from what was taught by our Divine Master, and quite inconsistent with that high moral teaching which pervades the New Testament. Our reason for thinking this, springs from the stress laid upon what must generally be a mere change of feeling, which is spoken of as 'finding salvation,' or 'being saved,' and from the complete ignoring of the sacraments. The immense importance attached to the former of these, is thus described in the *Doctrines of the Salvation Army*, a book purporting to be written by 'General' Booth: *Never tell them that they are saved if they don't think so.*¹ When a man gets saved God will tell him about it, and then he will not need you to tell him so.' For sacraments is substituted human sympathy; the members of the Army are to do all that men or women can do to encourage and help those whom they can bring under their influence, but neither in the book already named, nor in a pamphlet by the same author styled *Orders and Regulations for Soldiers of the Salvation Army*, is there any mention of either sacrament.

A principle laid down in the book is: '*The first essential that must be borne in mind as governing every scheme that may be put forward is that it must change the man, when it is his character and conduct which constitute the reasons for his failure in the battle of life.*'² With this principle we entirely agree, but for the reasons just given we can see nothing contained in the proposals we are examining, that is capable of effecting this change.

We cannot regret to see any plans tried that may be productive of benefit to individuals, though we may feel assured that the good effected will be much more limited than the sanguine workers may anticipate; but we do regret to find that benevolent people are moved so much more easily by sensational appeals, than they are by simple statements of the wants of the people, and by less exciting proposals for their alleviation. It is disappointing to find much attention and sympathy given to exciting novel schemes, whilst well-tried, steady plans of usefulness that can show much good work and some success are neglected. To those who have worked in the field of philanthropy the promises held out by sen-

¹ The italics are not ours.

² In *Darkest England*, p. 85.

sati
they
attr
con
chan
of t
tam
to a
disp
wha
echo
us th
Salv
likel
the
gious
expe
the p

Vetus
a
a
B

WHET
long ti
Codex
import
Codex
publica
In the
stigma
to it, o
years m
any rat
throw
Stevens
the Gre
Queen
lished b
history
sources
genealog
even yet
contents

sational writers may be recognized as more than exaggerated; they may be felt to be ridiculous; but to those who are attracted by new plans, by unblushing self-assertion, by confident assurances of success, there are evidently great charms in puffing and self-advertisement. What the system of the Salvation Army is in the streets, with its drums and tambourines, its processions and its shoutings and singing to attract public notice, its gimcrack titles and pretentious displays, its loud vauntings of success, and contempt for what more sober Christian folk are doing, find an appropriate echo in the book we have been examining, and it seems to us that those who have faith in the religious system of the Salvation Army may accept the promises of the book as likely to be realized; but to those who have no such faith the case is altogether different; and as we believe the religious system of the Army to be hollow and unreal, so we expect no permanent elevation of the masses to result from the philanthropic labours of the 'General' of that Army.

SHORT NOTICES.

Vetus Testamentum juxta LXX interpretum versionem e codice omnium antiquissimo Græco Vaticano 1209 phototypice representatum auspice Leone XIII. Pont. Max., curante J. COZZA LUZI, Abate Basiliano. (Romæ, 1890.)

WHETHER the claim—*omnium antiquissimus*—made in the above long title is absolutely justified or not, it is certain that the great *Codex Vaticanus*, as this is called *par excellence*, has only one rival in importance, and that is the *Codex Sinaiticus* at St. Petersburg. The *Codex Alexandrinus* is at any rate later in time than these two. The publication which we are about to notice is important in two ways. In the first place, it once and for ever removes from the Library the stigma which has so long (and, must we add, deservedly?) attached to it, on account of its reluctance to disclose its treasures. Of late years much has been done to help us to form some idea of a few at any rate of the MSS. stored in the recesses of the Library, and to throw light on its past history. Such Catalogues as those of Stevenson, published in 1885 and 1888, give us a valuable key to the Greek Palatine MSS. and those belonging to the collections of Queen Christina and Pius II., and such books as those recently published by Ehrle and Duchesne throw interesting light on the past history of the Library, which often has an important bearing on the sources from which the MSS. came, and therefore on their possible genealogical relation to the treasures of other libraries. We are of course even yet far from having anything like an adequate knowledge of the contents of the MSS., which forty years ago were officially returned

as numbering 25,000. But the Vatican Library is not the only offender in this respect. In fact, we may say that the French libraries are almost the only ones of which we know much, and that they are an exception is due largely to M. Omont. The Bodleian Library at Oxford is now, by its proposed *Summary Catalogue*, following M. Omont's excellent lead; but in most of the great libraries of Europe the only available Catalogues are often obsolete in phraseology, and inadequate both in quality and quantity. But, besides giving us the history of the Library, the authorities are also giving us *in extenso* the contents of some important MSS. Thus it is only three years ago that we obtained the excellent edition by Ciasca of Tatian's *Diatessaron* (based on an almost unique Arabic MS. in the Vatican), which was noticed in our last number. In 1889 we had given to us the photographed facsimile of the *Codex Vaticanus* for the New Testament, which enabled scholars to use for themselves the evidence of this most important witness. Now we have, in the publication under notice, the first instalment of the contents of the LXX from the same MS. The Old Testament must be held to have been more fortunate than the New in the value of its earlier editions. While it may be said that only within, comparatively speaking, the last few years have students of the Greek Testament had within their hands a continuous critical text based on early authorities, and while the standard text for purposes of collation is *still* either that in Stephens's edition of 1550, or Elzevir's of 1633, in the LXX on the other hand, as early as 1587, there was produced under the editorship of Morinus a fairly truthful representation of the *Codex Vaticanus*, which called forth the not undeserved praise of Tischendorf in the *Prolegomena* to his edition of the LXX. This text, moreover—and not a faulty one, as in the case of the New Testament—was made the basis of the collations in Holmes and Parsons' valuable, though often unduly depreciated, critical edition of a hundred years ago. We may see, from such a book as Scrivener's *Introduction to the New Testament*, how many and how unsuccessful have been the attempts to procure adequate knowledge of the New Testament part of the *Codex Vaticanus*, which were not even satisfied by the much criticized facsimile edition in six volumes (1869–81). Now, however, by the help of photography, we have to all intents and purposes the MS. before our own eyes, and may apply, in another sense from that of the editor, the quotation given in the preface to this edition—

‘Sol tibi signa dabit. Solem quis dicere falsum
Audeat?’

It is as showing us the gradual extension of the use of photography to such purposes that this volume has a second important value. Quite recently, in the late Bishop of Durham's edition of *Clement of Rome*, we had a new departure in the reproduction, by photography, of the *whole* of the text of Clement contained in the Constantinopolitan MS., and that in a book published at a price which was not prohibitive to the private individual. Though few, if any, individuals will venture to give the price asked for the facsimile

we are now noticing, yet it will be found in the great Libraries of England and the Continent, and so the MS. may be used without the expense of a journey to the Vatican. In a short time, no doubt, the advance of photography will certainly make it as cheap to have manuscripts photographed, as collated; and not only will it increase the facility of using them, but it will infinitely lessen the danger of accidents, like the great fire at Ashburnham House in 1731, which have from time to time irretrievably destroyed the manuscript treasures of the past.

After this somewhat lengthy introduction, we will proceed to give some idea of the volume before us. The Old Testament is contained on 1,234 pages, ending with the Book of Daniel, the last in order of the major prophets, which in this, as in other MSS. of the LXX, are preceded by the minor prophets. Of these 1,234 pages, those numbered from 1 to 40 are lost, so that the *Codex* at present begins with Gen. xlv. 28, and from this place to Judges iii. 14, or 230 pages in all, have now been photographed. We have compared one or two chapters here and there with the recent Cambridge edition, and also with the edition of Mai. Within the first few verses (viz. in Gen. xlv. 30) we lighted on a variant—ἐπειδὴ for ἐπει— which at first we were inclined to regard as one of the many errors attributed to the facsimile edition of 1869–81. But, on reference, that edition will be found to agree with the MS., and so presumably the Cambridge editors have followed Tischendorf, who wrongly gives ἐπει as the reading of the MS. In the same passage (xlv. 30) it is more than questionable whether σοῦ is, as the Cambridge editors imply, B^{a.7b}, i.e. a correction introduced by one or other of two correctors instead of σέ, the supposed reading of the first hand. It does not follow because the ο is smaller than the letters on each side of it, that it has been, as the Germans say, 'eingeschoben,' for a similar phenomenon meets us often (e.g. in the next verse, Deut. xiii. 2, and elsewhere, and that not only at the end of lines), where there is no reason for doubt that it is by the first hand. But this question is a hard one, and though it is unsatisfactory to be unable 'to escape from provisionally accepting this grouping (i.e. that of the Vatican edition) of the hands of B, and equally impossible to accept it without mistrust' (Cambridge edition, p. xix.), yet the photographed edition will not help us. There are some things as to which the photograph is said to be clearer than the original (just as a photograph of a hulk of a ship brings out a name that has been so painted over as to be invisible to the naked eye), but the discrimination of hands, except from the forms of the letters, is not one of them; nor, of course, does it mark a difference in the ink used, which often affords a clue. In some respects, the results of the photographic operation do not seem as successful as the reproduction of the four pages at the end of the sixth volume of the facsimile edition. The letters are not so clearly marked, for their colour is more approximated to that of the material on which they are written. Thus we are unable to detect sometimes whether the MS. reads the *ν ἐφελκυστικόν*, which is ascribed to it, for example, in the Cambridge

edition in Gen. xlvii. 4, 5, 13, and elsewhere. No trace of the mark *supra lineam*, by which final ν is generally denoted, seems to be visible in the photograph. Similarly, the *rasurae*, to which the editors of the facsimile edition, using the original MS., refer—as, for example, in Deut. xiii. (f. 211, col. i. ll. 12, 15)—are barely discernible in the photograph. But though the photograph will not take the place of the original MS. in these and similar instances, yet it is of immense value to have such ocular demonstration where hitherto we have been dependent on the collations of others, and we cannot be too grateful for the multiplication of such works as the one before us; for they are a sign that the authorities feel a due sense of responsibility for the treasures entrusted to them, and they are also evidence of the use to which the advance of scientific discovery may be increasingly turned in the interest of true religion and sound learning.

ἸΠΟΣ ΕΒΡΑΙΟΥΣ. *The Epistle to the Hebrews, with Notes.* By C. J. VAUGHAN, D.D., Dean of Llandaff. (London: Macmillan and Co., 1890.)

No one can look into Dr. Vaughan's commentary without being struck with the care and pains which he has bestowed upon it. It has quite the aspect of that which has been shaped and reshaped till it has assumed its present form. The explanation is to be found in what he tells us of its origin. The commentary 'is just the record of the latest thoughts upon the sacred book in question of one whose time has been largely given, for the last thirty years, to the work of explaining the Greek Testament to a long succession of students for ordination.' It would appear that of the books of the New Testament this epistle was a favourite one, and that during the last thirty years he has read it again and again with his students. It could not fail, under these circumstances, that much valuable matter for the elucidation of the epistle should be accumulated, and that it should be shaped and balanced the one part against the other, so as to form a consistent whole.

Dr. Vaughan does not concern himself much with the great critical questions as to date, destination, and authorship; he is content to rest upon the undoubted facts of its authority and canonicity. Nevertheless there is a paragraph in his preface which is of considerable value, in which he brings together a number of indications, some of them new, which all point to St. Paul.

'There are passages in the Epistle in which we might seem to hear his very voice. Such are the closing words, telling of the release of Timothy, and of the prospect of the writer's visiting with him the Church addressed. Like, yet not too much like, the passage in Phil. ii. 19-24, in which he purposes to send Timothy, and hopes that he also himself shall come shortly. The second chapter of our Epistle gives us a quotation used by St. Paul himself in writing to the Corinthians, and comments upon it almost to the same purpose. The argument of the fourth chapter recalls, at least by its ellipses, that of the third chapter of the letter to the Galatians; and the reproofs of the sixth and tenth chapters rival in their severity,

and not less in their alternations of severity and tenderness, those of the fourth and fifth chapters of the same Epistle to Galatia. To say that there is no indication in the Epistle of any other doctrine than the Evangelical system of St. Paul, is to say little more than that both are Scripture; but the Scripture of both alike differs widely in expression from the Scripture of St. James or of St. John. Even passages of which the first reading suggests the comment, "This cannot be St. Paul," may find their parallels somewhere, if not in his written words, yet in records of his speeches by St. Luke: as, for example, the grand opening of the Epistle before us in the main paragraph of his address at Athens (Acts xvii. 24), and the clause most unlike him of all, "confirmed unto us by them that heard Him" (Heb. ii. 3), in his own argument at Antioch in Pisidia (Acts xiii. 31), "He was seen many days of them which came up with Him from Galilee to Jerusalem, who are His witnesses unto the people" (p. xiii).

The fourth chapter mentioned by the author in the above extract has always seemed to us to bear the marks of St. Paul's mind—that is to say, in its mode of argumentation and sequence of thought. And this impression grows upon one rather than diminishes. There is also a point in the passage chap. ii. 8, 9 to which he alludes which he has not brought out. It is not only as a quotation similarly treated here and in Corinthians, but here it is *so* treated as to bring out a peculiarity of St. Paul which might almost be called a mannerism. We mean the peculiarity by which he takes up a word and goes on ringing changes on it. 'Thou hast put all things in subjection under His feet; for in that He put all in subjection under Him he left nothing that is not put under Him. But now we see not yet all things put under Him.' Yet, notwithstanding this, we agree with the author that the composition of the Epistle, at least with the exception of the last chapter, is not St. Paul's. But these indications may be considered as proving that the writer was really, as St. Clement indicates, interpreting St. Paul's statements and thoughts, and the last passage might seem to prove that St. Paul revised it and made alterations before its publication.

The author approaches the Epistle with a strong bias against the Catholic doctrine of the Eucharist. This is just what we might have anticipated; but it is none the less unfortunate in view of a genuine deciphering of the great thoughts lying in the Epistle. In regard to the sacrifice of Christ the author limits it to two acts, His death upon the Cross and His entrance into the heavenly sanctuary. These acts he regards as past and ended. It is a thought which to us seems strange, almost unthinkable, and we wonder whether the author has ever fairly faced it. Has he ever thought out, in its consequences, the idea that Christ's sacrifice is ended, and is a thing of the past? What would be the consequence to us if this were the case? Or, to put it differently, how could Christ's sacrifice possibly be ended? How could Christ divest Himself of the character of being our Priest and our Sacrifice? No doubt the sacrifice is one, emphatically one, and once for all. The cross and the heavenly sanctuary are but stages in the One Sacrifice. The One Victim slain upon the cross is the same who is raised up, and enters the heavenly sanctuary, 'now

to appear in the presence of God for us.' But in what character is He to appear? Surely in the character of our Sacrifice, our Propitiation, our Atonement. Could He at all appear in any other character? Is it not clear that so long as He is in heaven before the face of the Father 'for us' He must be our Sacrifice, our Propitiation, our Atonement?

It would almost seem as if the author had pictured to himself a literal mercy-seat in heaven, and had supposed Christ entering literally with His Blood, and sprinkling it, so that this act of sprinkling, like an earthly or sublunary act, is one which can be begun, performed, and ended, never again to be repeated. This seems to be in his mind when he strangely argues (p. 182) from οὐδ' ἵνα πολλάκις προσφέρῃ, which he wrongly limits to the heavenly oblation, that the *continuance* or *repetition* of that oblation is there condemned. But there is no ground for supposing such a literal act, which might be done and ended. The whole idea is crude and unsuitable, and it has no basis in the Epistle. On the contrary, the Apostle, when describing the entrance of Christ into the heavenly sanctuary with His own Blood, pictures the heavenly oblation as one grand continuous act extending over all Gospel time. He says that Christ entered in 'now' to appear in the presence of God for us, and even the author interprets 'now' of the whole Gospel time. It is to us a matter of wonder how the author can maintain his view in the face of what the writer of the epistle so much insists upon, that Christ is a Priest for ever, that He has a Priesthood that cannot pass away from Him, that He is even now a Minister (λειτουργὸς) of the heavenly sanctuary, and that even now we have Him as an High Priest over the house of God.

The effect of this misapprehension, as regards the rest of the Epistle, is far-reaching. As a consequence, our author cannot see the contrast between the shadow of the law and the reality of the Gospel, as the writer of the Epistle has drawn it. He cannot see the great principles of Christian worship which lie imbedded in that contrast, nor can he see the bearing of the whole upon the Eucharist. Similarly the passages in which the Eucharist is specially alluded to or mentioned, are not perceived by him. One thing, however, we might have expected. We might have thought that such a careful observer of grammatical construction would have seen at least in xiii. 10 that the sentence is so constructed that *θυσιαστήριον* must mean the Eucharistic altar. If we interpret it of the Cross, or of our Lord, or, as the author does, of the Sacrifice generally, then we make the Apostle say what is not true, for surely not only the servers of the tabernacle, but all men have a right to eat—that is, to believe in Christ and His Sacrifice.

The Epistles of St. Paul to Titus, Philemon, and the Hebrews, with Notes Critical and Practical. By the Rev. M. F. SADLER. (London: George Bell and Sons, 1890.)

MR. SADLER continues his commentary on the New Testament, and the present instalment embraces Titus, Philemon, and the Hebrews.

The same excellent character and tone is maintained, and the work will be of especial usefulness both to the educated laity and to clergy who may not have time to go into extensive reading. We have again to remark on the excellence of the introductory notices, which embrace in a clear and pointed way all that it is necessary to note. This is especially conspicuous in the introductions to Titus and Philemon, where, in the case of the former, we have a brief and clear statement of the testimonies, followed by a *résumé* of the notices regarding him in the New Testament. In the case of Philemon, to the doubt which might be suggested as against its having a place in the canon, seeing that it does not treat of doctrine, a clear and practical answer is given, showing its immense importance as a guide to the Church in dealing with the difficult question of slavery.

In the introduction to the Epistle to the Hebrews, the author deals with the questions of the Church to which it was addressed, the authorship, and the date. In regard to the first point, there is hardly any doubt that it was the Church of Jerusalem which was addressed, and this is the view that the author takes. The second question is far more difficult, and the views that are taken of it are more divergent. The author arrives at the same conclusion as we are inclined to adopt—viz. that the authorship is double, being primarily that of St. Paul, and secondarily that of St. Luke. This part of the subject is well treated, and the only thing we would remark is that the author does not recognize so fully as we should be inclined to do, the fact that the testimony of St. Clement to the authorship, as given by Eusebius, is the traditional view, and not, as is sometimes held, a mere conjecture to obviate a difficulty. In this we think the testimony of St. Clement differs from that of Origen. The author substantiates the conclusion at which he arrives by quoting in its support Delitzsch and the very interesting account of Dr. Döllinger.

The difficulties connected with the question of authorship are, as we have remarked, very great, and one of them—the contrast, not only in style, but also in ideas, to the other epistles of St. Paul—is well pointed out by the author. He says—

The High Priesthood of the Eternal Son is the theme of the Epistle to the Hebrews—one really may say to the exclusion of every other—till we come to the eleventh chapter. There it is dropped, to be resumed again before the conclusion at xiii. 8 and following. Now, the Eternal Priesthood of Christ is not once mentioned in any of the thirteen Epistles of St. Paul, or, in fact, in any book of the New Testament, except in this solitary Epistle. The Mediatorship of Christ is mentioned abundantly, as, for instance, in 1 Tim. ii., "There is one God and one Mediator," &c., but not under priestly forms. The Mediatorship of Christ pervades the Epistle to the Hebrews, but only under the priestly form. Even in xii. 24, where only it is specifically mentioned under the name of Mediatorship, it is "Jesus, the Mediator of the New Covenant," not, as in 1 Tim. ii., "There is one Mediator between God and men, the Man Christ Jesus."

'Now, when we turn to the Epistles of St. Paul, especially those to the Romans, Corinthians, and Galatians, we find them pervaded with the Mediatorship of Christ, but not once in the form in which it appears in

the Epistle to the Hebrews. In the acknowledged Pauline Epistles the Mediatorship acts through the risen and glorified Head, who does not pass into a heavenly Holy of Holies to act there as a Priest, but is exalted at once to the right hand of God, and acts there as a federal Head of the Church, a second Adam, having all His people joined together in the unity of His Body—a mystical Body. Thus, in Coloss. ii. 19, "The Head, from which all the body by joints and bands having nourishment ministered, and knit together, increaseth with the increase of God." Thus again Eph. i. 23-24, and iv. 15-16, and v. 23-30; also Rom. xii. 4-5, and 1 Cor. xii. 12-27¹ (p. xx).

All this is very striking; and yet we think it ought not to be pressed, as some might be inclined to press it, to exclude St. Paul from any share in the authorship. What is remarkable about St. Paul is the many-sidedness of his intellect. He is as different as possible from a man of one idea. Whenever new circumstances arose, or new thoughts broke in, he could face the situation and look all round it. It is certainly true that he looks at the Mediatorship of Christ in his epistles in the way stated by the author, and that this contrasts with the view in the Epistle to the Hebrews; but we think there is a link which forms an easy transition from the one to the other. That link is the fact that St. Paul, all through, contemplated Christ as our Sacrifice. In Eph. v. 3 he speaks of Christ as 'having loved us and given Himself for us, an offering and a sacrifice to God for a sweet-smelling savour.' And in Rome iii. 25 he speaks of Him as being set forth for a propitiation. It is plain that the whole development of the sacrificial idea in the Epistle to the Hebrews is logically contained in this simpler form. In truth, the idea of Christ as our Sacrifice only wanted to be put in connexion with the sacrificial worship of the old covenant to assume the form which it actually takes in the Epistle to the Hebrews. And in point of fact, St. Paul, who had a keen eye to the typology of the old covenant, had already, so to speak, begun this development by placing the Sacrifice of Christ in connexion with the Passover.

We thus see that in substance the sacrificial doctrine of the Epistle to the Hebrews is the doctrine of St. Paul; and, more than this, that it is really needed to complete the Pauline doctrine. And we may conjecture how, when St. Paul was called upon to deal practically with the troubles and difficulties of the Church of Jerusalem, the whole of this grand view burst upon him as a revelation. It is true that we have not the statement of it in his own language; but, if the view which is the most probable be true, it was carefully elaborated from statements of the Apostle by St. Luke, and received the impress of the Apostle's sanction.

One great feature in Mr. Sadler's commentary is that he brings the Epistle into clear connexion with the Eucharist. He not only notes the bearings on the Eucharist of particular passages, but he gives an excellent excursus on the subject. This is a most important feature, and to us very refreshing, accustomed as we are to commentaries in which this aspect of the Epistle is ignored. Mr. Sadler has broken ground in this direction, but we cannot conceal from ourselves that a great deal still remains to be done.

CA
wh
rea
Th
pop
wri
ser
acc
som
Ray
tivil
bet
and
peo
the
whic
inva
was
whom
pref
Reli
prov
origi
and
poin
the o
of O
critic
Zeru
lating
assign
devic
work
no de
popu
given
views
unim
we no
refere
which
they s
where
seriou
graphi
book
exhaus
getisch

Men of the Bible. Ezra and Nehemiah : their Lives and Times. By
REV. CANON RAWLINSON. (London : J. Nisbet and Co.)

CANON RAWLINSON undertook that part of the *Speaker's Commentary* which deals with Ezra and Nehemiah, and it is probably for that reason that he has been chosen to write their lives in this useful series. This choice has been quite justified, for the book before us is a popular and yet scholarly account of the period, not very brightly written, but yet quite readable. It may be said to be eminently conservative in tone, and shows a reluctance, perhaps justifiable, to accept any of the recent hypotheses as proved, even when they have some basis of fact. Thus, in regard to the religion of Cyrus, Canon Rawlinson holds that his edict permitting the return from the Captivity was due to 'a recognition by Cyrus of a certain resemblance between his own religion and that of the Israelites—a resemblance and conformity which caused him to feel a keen sympathy with the people, and a strong desire to help and benefit them.' The value of the evidence on the other side, found on the well-known Cylinder, which has been used to show that Cyrus was not a monotheist, is invalidated, Canon Rawlinson thinks, by the fact that the inscription was 'issued, not by Cyrus himself, but by the priests of Bel-Merodach, who would be interested in misrepresenting him.' So, too, in the preface, he rightly discounts the value of Kuenen's book on the *Religion of Israel* because of its 'confident adoption of quite unproved and most improbable hypotheses with respect to the late origin of the Mosaic law, and the promulgation of much of it by Ezra and Nehemiah for the first time.' There is no doubt that, as is pointed out by a writer on 'Zerubbabel and the Second Temple' in the current number of *Le Muséon*, criticism has run riot in this period of Old Testament history, as in others. It is, for example, an uncritical ignoring of the facts which would resolve the return under Zerubbabel into a groundless tradition, and assume that the repopulating of Palestine was really a gradual process, which later became assigned to Zerubbabel in accordance with the well-known historical device of ascribing to one person and one age, what was really the work of many people and covered many years. But though we have no desire for such 'vagaries of the higher criticism,' especially in a popular book, we could have wished that Canon Rawlinson had given in his notes a few more references to later authorities and later views than Stanley and Ewald. We have one reference, and that unimportant, to Hunter's *After the Exile* (the second part of which we notice elsewhere); but with that exception there is hardly any reference to recent literature. Popular books, such as the series to which this belongs, should of course be popular in treatment, but they should also have references to books bearing on their subjects, where a more critical and minute study is to be found. Another serious omission is that there is hardly any treatment of the topographical references which make one of the chief difficulties in the book of Nehemiah. This complaint Ryssel had already made in his exhaustive commentary on [this book (in the *Kurzgefasstes exegetisches Handbuch*) in regard to Canon Rawlinson's edition of it

in the *Speaker's Commentary*, and we may repeat it here in regard to this, his later work. Indeed, on p. 95, he quotes from Stanley a passage which *seems* to place the 'western and northern side' between the Spring of the Dragon and the royal reservoir, and glides lightly over the question as to whether Nehemiah's right side went all round the city, or whether he 'turned back' by the route with which he had started. Another criticism that will naturally occur to the reader is that the quotations from Stanley are too many and too long, being often introduced without any special point. On p. 32 Esther is an obvious misprint for Ezra, and, on p. 156, the reference should be to Stanley vol. iii. and not vol. ii., but the book seems carefully and accurately printed. We have put first such criticisms as have suggested themselves, and it will be seen that they do not detract from the value of the book as a whole. It does not, as we have said, enter into critical questions, and hardly ever becomes polemical, though on p. 139 there is a not wholly unmerited reproof of some 'modern German critics' who 'seem to look on truthfulness and sincerity as quite superfluous elements of moral character, and approve or condone, in an Old Testament saint, qualities which in a Jesuit of to-day would call forth their strongest and most earnest reprobation.' Canon Rawlinson is perhaps obliged by the nature of the case to state conclusions, without entering on a discussion of reasons, which would perhaps be out of place in such a book. But with some of these conclusions we cannot help disagreeing, as for instance with the identification of Artaxerxes and Pseudo-Smerdis—an identification impossible on linguistic grounds, and not needed by the facts of the case. There are probably few books of the Old Testament in which it is less easy for the ordinary reader to find out for himself the importance of the facts so briefly recorded, than in these books of Ezra and Nehemiah. In connexion with Mr. Hunter's book, which at greater length and with a more lively style covers the same ground as Canon Rawlinson, we have already noticed the importance of the period as the latest in the Old Testament, and therefore one worthy of the closest examination, that we may, if possible, see which way the lines of thought are tending, which have to be taken up again four hundred years later in the New Testament. This importance Canon Rawlinson brings out, and he indicates clearly enough the main points, within Judaism itself, and in the relations of Judaism to the nations round, especially the Samaritans, which give it this importance. Nor does he fail to mark the salient features in the two prominent characters who at this period had such an influence on the way in which the problems which came up for solution were solved. We are inclined to think, however, that he rather unnecessarily depreciates Nehemiah's character, when he finds in it 'self-complacency' and 'a tinge of Pharisaism,' while he hardly recognizes that Ezra as a reformer would probably have failed, unless he had been supported by the more practical, and equally religious, temper of Nehemiah.

189
Af
TH
ove
or i
Hay
an c
B.C.
year
visit
imp
of E
not
some
cove
prop
have
one v
chara
one s
regar
oppo
howe
thusi
other
the d
appea
out h
himse
visit t
the re
these
results
may b
But th
to the
Jerusa
bourin
questi
place,
to have
we hav
wards
questi
parties,
Thirld
'Idyll
of Ruth
VOL

After the Exile. Part II. The Coming of Ezra to the Samaritan Schism. By P. HAY HUNTER, Minister of Yester. (Edinburgh and London : Oliphant, Anderson and Ferrier, 1890.)

THE first part of this work, which we noticed last year, carried us over the period from the Close of the Exile to the Coming of Ezra, or in other words, about three quarters of the period with which Mr. Hay Hunter proposed to deal. In the part now before us, we have an examination of the last quarter of the century: that is to say, from B.C. 459, the date of Ezra's coming to Jerusalem, down to about the year B.C. 430, when the Old Testament history ceases with the second visit of Nehemiah to Jerusalem. In many ways this volume is more important than the first, because it investigates the position and work of Ezra; but it is also in some ways less interesting, because we have not here so much contemporary literature to assist and brighten the somewhat dull historical record of Ezra and Nehemiah. The period covered by the last part introduced to us several of the minor prophets with their side-lights on the progress of the history. Now we have only two, Jonah and Malachi. But if the interest is lessened in one way, it is certainly increased by the 'striking personalities' whose characters Mr. Hay Hunter throws into such strong relief. On the one side we have Ezra, the type of the religious reformer, with no regard for the social or political considerations which influenced his opponents in their support of the intermarriage with Gentiles—who is, however, for a while unable to kindle more than a transient enthusiasm for the *Torah*, on which he relies for his authority. On the other side we have Nehemiah, the 'perfect gentleman,' who, by a use of the diplomacy he had learnt at the court of Artaxerxes, and a judicious appeal to national pride, succeeds in the face of opposition in carrying out his design of rebuilding the walls of Jerusalem. He then lends himself to execute Ezra's designs, and, at any rate on his second visit to Jerusalem, catches somewhat of his master's zeal in achieving the reforms which Ezra by himself had been powerless to effect. Both these characters are drawn very accurately, and it is surprising what results the scanty references in the books of Ezra and Nehemiah may be made to produce by an appreciative and observant reader. But the personalities are interesting chiefly because of their relation to the current history. The chief question on which feeling at Jerusalem was strongly divided was that of intermarriage with neighbouring nations. We are shown in the volume before us how this question really had most far-reaching consequences. In the first place, Ezra, in order to show that this intermarriage was wrong, had to have recourse to his own interpretation of the law of Moses; and so we have the first instance of that appeal to tradition which was afterwards so characteristic of Jewish scribes. In the second place, this question was the occasion of the first sign of that division into parties, which became emphasized during the subsequent period. Thirdly, it led to the Samaritan schism. There is one chapter headed 'Idyll and Allegory' connected with this subject, in which the books of Ruth and Jonah are discussed. The attempt is made to show that

the Book of Ruth was an idyll composed about this time, with the object of vindicating the rights of the Gentiles, though its historical setting is the period of the Judges. This didactic purpose, we are told, was first suggested by Umbreit and developed by Geiger, and it is very plausible, if we could only allow ourselves to forget that it is entirely arbitrary. Similarly, the book of Jonah, recently so much discussed, is regarded as an allegory teaching the same lesson that Gentiles as well as Jews are God's children. This view of the book of Jonah we believe to be absolutely untenable. It is a large question, on which we cannot now enter. But readers of this review will not need to be reminded, of what seems to be too often forgotten, that the use made of this book by our Blessed Lord in His reference to the 'men of Nineveh' makes it plain that He considered the repentance of Nineveh to be a piece of true history. And this is absolutely fatal to the fanciful notion of the book being an allegory.

We have already said that Jonah and Malachi are the only two prophets who are used to illustrate the history of the period. Of Jonah we have just spoken. The chapter on Malachi throws a great deal of light on the position and language of the prophet. Perhaps it is a little arbitrary to fix the date so closely between Nehemiah's departure after his first sojourn of twelve years at Jerusalem, and his return (from Babylon) at a later date, nor is it easy to see more than a general appropriateness in the reference of such a passage as Mal. ii. 5-7 to Ezra. But, apart from such things as these, the treatment of Malachi's prophecy is very instructive: 'In his person prophecy passes over to the ranks of the *Sopherim*, or the *Sopherim* produce a prophet. His standpoint is clearly defined. He is Puritan and anti-Zadokite.' 'As a prophet he was the sworn enemy of formalism, . . . as a scribe he held that the priest should be a guide and teacher of his people.'

Besides such literary criticisms and expositions as these which have been quoted in reference to Ruth, Jonah, and Malachi, we have set before us the importance of this period historically in the development of Judaism. The insistence on the importance of the *Torah*, and the deepening of a sense of the relation and responsibility of the individual to God (on which Ezekiel had already laid stress)—these were Ezra's main tenets, again and again asserted. As a corollary to these came the various institutions connected by legend with the name of Ezra, though not always historically traceable to him, such as the beginning of a Hebrew Canon of the Old Testament, the important position of the *Sopherim* or scribes, the institution of explanatory paraphrases of the Bible, later known as *Targums*. All these general points, and many others of interest and importance, are discussed in the volume before us, with a reference in all cases to the passages in the Bible and elsewhere which are their authority. Special points of difficulty in the text, such as the Ahasuerus of Ezra iv. 6, or the connexion and proper position of apparently misplaced sections, such as Ezra iv. 6-23, or Neh. viii.-x., are not passed over.

We can only hope that Mr. Hay Hunter, having traced Jewish history through the first hundred years after the Exile, will feel moved

189
to t
th
the
whi
fide
high
read
Bibl

THE
It pr
of Pa
logica
any i
treat
been
graph
first o
based
tina,
(as is
The s
Engla
the in
literat
ciencie
as the
but fin
Röhric
and lea
such s
their d
from ti
Vereins
Palestin
possible
for the
and the
present,
mous la
Europe,
very lit
covers t
subject,
Bibliogr
list of

to try and grope his way through the darkness which follows, in order that he may throw as much light on, and inspire as much interest in, the later and not less important period, as he has done in the part of which he has now treated. We can recommend this part as confidently as we did the earlier volume, and we need not give it any higher praise than to say it is as good, as readable, and as well worth reading as the first part.

Bibliotheca Geographica Palestinæ. Chronologisches Verzeichniss der auf die Geographie des heiligen Landes bezüglichen Literatur von 333 bis 1878 und Versuch einer Cartographie. Herausgegeben von REINHOLD RÖHRICHT. (Berlin: H. Reuther's Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1890.)

THE title indicates clearly enough the general character of this book. It professes to give a list of all the books relating to the geography of Palestine, from the year A.D. 333 to A.D. 1878, and also a chronological list of maps relating to Palestine. But the title does not give any idea of the exhaustive method in which the subject has been treated; the completeness is such that the book, which has rightly been described as 'indispensable' to students of Palestinian geography, will be found of great service in many other fields. We will first of all indicate the extent of ground covered by the book. It is based to some extent on Tobler's *Bibliographia Geographica Palestinæ*, a work of somewhat the same character as the one before us (as is shown by the similarity in titles), which was published in 1868. The societies formed about that time for the study of this subject in England, Germany, and the United States gave a great stimulus to the interest felt in Palestinian geography, with the result that the literature dealing with it has enormously increased. Such deficiencies as there were in Tobler's work, Röhricht, and others, such as the late Comte Riant and Professor Socin attempted to supply, but finally, to meet the felt need of a complete book of reference Röhricht has published the volume before us, going down to 1878, and leaving recent literature to be dealt with in the publications of such societies as have been noticed. That these bodies recognize their duties in this respect is clear from the bibliographies which have from time to time appeared in the *Zeitschrift des deutschen Palestina-Vereins*, and the recent promise in the quarterly statement of the Palestine Exploration Society, that such lists, complete as far as possible, shall be published. We are likely, then, to have a record for the future, but it is for the past that we are often in difficulties, and these difficulties have been overcome by such a volume as the present, the compilation of which must have been a work of enormous labour. The number of assistants in almost every country of Europe, and also in America, is an almost sufficient guarantee that very little of importance has been omitted. After a list, which covers ten pages, of many important general works bearing on the subject, such as the *Dictionary of the Bible*, Müller's *Orientalische Bibliographie*, and the *Theologischer Jahresbericht*, begins the detailed list of books, starting with the well-known *Itinerarium Antonini*

Augusti. This list includes altogether 3,515 books, and covers nearly 600 pages, but many of these books are probably not of any permanent value. The chronological arrangement enables us to see at a glance the rapid rate at which the literature has been growing : thus nearly 2,000, or more than half of the whole number, are assigned to this century. The list of books is followed by a list of maps, which contains in all 747, beginning with the famous Peutinger tables, the date of which is about the middle of the fourth century. The work is completed by the long indices so necessary in a work of reference. There are separate indices of the authors and places, and of the manuscripts and archives, which have been ransacked for the information contained in the book. It remains for us to give an illustration of the way in which each book has been treated, and to show the general value which the book has for others besides students of Palestinian geography. We will take the well-known *Onomasticon* of Eusebius to illustrate the treatment. Under this we have (i.) the date ; then (ii.) a list of seven manuscripts containing the work, with a notice of them, and any references that have been made to them ; then (iii.) a list of the six editions in which it has appeared between the beginning of the seventeenth century and that of Lagarde. This book is complicated by Jerome's work, and accordingly a treatment on similar lines of Hieronymus *De Nominibus Locorum divinæ Scripturæ* is attached to the discussion of Eusebius's book. In the same way, to take one illustration from the maps, we have a list of nineteen editions which have dealt with the Peutinger tables between 1591 and 1888. Completeness and orderliness of arrangement, which are two essential features in a work of reference, are therefore noticeable in the book before us.

Lastly we may indicate the value of the book generally to others besides students of the special subject with which it professes to deal. It will be of use of course to students of ecclesiastical geography, if any such exist. There are a number of references to books, such as *Notitia dignitatum*, which are sometimes of primary importance in mapping out the ecclesiastical divisions of Christendom. The title, *Listes des monastères fondés en Palestine*, suggests a way of expanding the wonderful epitome of monasteries throughout the world given in Mas Latrie's *Trésor de Chronologie*. The ecclesiastical or general historian will find valuable references scattered through the book. Thus in connexion with the Crusades, besides the reference to Riant's *Inventaire critique* in *Les Archives de l'Orient Latin*, i. 1-224, we find enumerated the various sources of information, Eastern and Western, on this subject, which are specially concerned with the topography of Palestine. This is methodically arranged according to sources. 'Die occidentalischen Quellen sind zu trennen in (A) Chroniken und (B) Urkunden, von denen die ersteren alphabetisch aufgezählt werden, die letzteren wieder in solche zerfallen, welche den Besitz (i.) von *Kirchen*, (ii.) von *Orden*, (iii.) von *Handelscolonien* betreffen und die welche (iv.) *Staatsverträge* und (v.) *Verwaltungsvorschriften* enthalten.' Then follow ten pages or so of reference to authorities on the Crusades. Nor is this an isolated instance. We

hop
pat
num
pen
of r
on a
his
has
know

Stua

WE
stud
glad
It is
resul
—as
the f
vario
short
them
minu
paper

T
Auth
Auth
little
that i
early
expla
paper
The s
which
mann.
wheth
both i
argum
whole
and th
matten
sideral
is that
comm
observ
written
Gospel
basis o

hope, therefore, to have shown that this latest monument of German patience and industry is, as Sir Charles Wilson in the January number of the *Palestine Exploration Fund* described it, 'indispensable' to the student of Palestinian geography, and also a work of reference valuable to the general student of history and geography on account of the number of authorities which, by the assistance of his numerous helpers in most of the big libraries of Europe, Röhricht has brought to light from reviews or books in many cases little known.

Studia Biblica: Essays chiefly in Biblical and Patristic Criticism.

By Members of the University of Oxford. Edited by Professors S. R. DRIVER, T. K. CHEYNE, and W. SANDAY. Vol. ii. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1890.)

WE welcome most cordially the appearance of the second series of studies in Biblical criticism promoted by Professor Sanday, and are glad to note that it is being followed at a short interval by a third. It is an enterprise of great interest and value, partly for the actual results achieved, and partly—in the case of the younger contributors—as an exercise of powers from which much may be expected in the future. The present instalment contains seven essays, of very various characters. It would obviously be impossible to offer in a short notice any useful or effective criticism on the results obtained by them—results which in many cases depend on the careful handling of minute details of evidence; but the general character of the several papers may be briefly indicated.

The volume opens with a paper by Mr. Neubauer on 'The Authorship and Titles of the Psalms according to early Jewish Authorities,' of which the general result would appear to be that very little evidence of critical value is to be gained from this source, and that in the case of the titles of the Psalms the meaning of them was early lost, and the commentators were confessedly at sea in their explanations of them. Mr. F. H. Woods follows with a careful paper on 'The Origin and Mutual Relation of the Synoptic Gospels.' The subject is old; but the line of argument is an independent one, which has rarely been followed, except, to some extent, by Holtzmann. Mr. Woods endeavours to prove that the common basis—whether written or traditional—of the Synoptic Gospels coincided, both in its range and in its order, with our St. Mark. The line of argument which he develops is to the effect that the order of the whole of St. Mark is confirmed either by St. Matthew or St. Luke, and the greater part of it by both; while, on the other hand, the matter common to St. Matthew and St. Luke alone is in no considerable case arranged in the same order. The natural conclusion is that in the parts common to all three they were drawing from a common basis of which the order was fixed (which, it may be observed, clearly supports the view that this common basis was a written document); while in the parts common to the two longer Gospels their authors are not giving us a portion of the common basis omitted by St. Mark, but are drawing from some distinct source,

the material from which they incorporate into different positions in their narratives. An argument such as this necessarily rests on a minute examination of details, and cannot be discussed here; but it should be observed that Mr. Woods notes that an incidental result of it is to raise a presumption against the authenticity of the last twelve verses of St. Mark; though it may be questioned whether it shows more than that the 'common basis' did not treat of the appearances after the Resurrection, and that some one—whether St. Mark or another—added this passage to the recension of the common basis which appears in the second Gospel. Mr. Woods answers that St. Mark has made no other addition of equal length or importance; but the exceptional importance of the subject would justify an exceptional treatment.

The question of the date of St. Polycarp's martyrdom was discussed in the first volume of *Studia Biblica* by Mr. T. Randell, and it is followed up by Mr. C. H. Turner in a clever paper which stands third in the present volume. Mr. Turner accepts, as every scholar must since the appearance of Bishop Lightfoot's discussion of the subject, the period of the reign of Antoninus Pius, in preference to the earlier view, which assigns the martyrdom to the time of Marcus Aurelius; but he shows some reason to suppose that the precise year may have been A.D. 156 rather than A.D. 155. The issue turns on the method of intercalation practised in the Asiatic calendars in the second century, which is a matter of some obscurity. Mr. Turner exhibits both ingenuity and care in his treatment of it; but the most that can safely be said at present is that his view seems at least plausible. Epigraphic evidence is required to convert it into certainty, and it is far from impossible that this may still turn up in some of the many unexplored districts of Asia Minor.

Mr. C. Bigg follows with a discussion of an obscure problem in patristic literature, the origin and nature of the Homilies attributed to Clement of Rome, which he describes at some length, finally explaining their strange and composite character by the theory that they are the recast of an orthodox work by a highly unorthodox editor, the latter being, of course, of Ebionite persuasions. The original work may have been composed about 200 A.D., while the recasting took place in the course of the next century, possibly at Rome, by a disciple of Alexander of Apamea, or even by Alexander himself, but more probably, in Mr. Bigg's opinion, at Antioch. The fifth essay is by Mr. L. J. M. Bebb, on 'The Evidence of the Early Versions and Patristic Quotations on the Text of the Books of the New Testament.' This is part of an Ellerton prize essay, and it encourages a hope that its author may produce work hereafter of the same sound and careful description, and possibly resulting in more positive and definite conclusions. The present paper contains rather a definition of the problems surrounding an enquiry into the versions and quotations than any attempt to estimate the results which may be achieved by it. It shows the care which is necessary in using these materials; but Mr. Bebb is also fully aware of the value of the evidence which they may contain, and it is to be hoped that his commendable caution in pro-

cedure will not prevent his arriving at clear and positive judgments upon this or any other problem of Biblical criticism to which he may direct his powers.

The two remaining papers may be dismissed more briefly, not as being less able, but as being more descriptive in character and dealing less with debateable matter. Mr. G. H. Gwilliam describes the form in which the Eusebian Canons and the Ammonian sections appear in manuscripts of the Peshitto, which differs from that with which we are familiar in the Greek text; and Mr. H. J. White relates the history of the famous *Codex Amiatinus* of the Vulgate version, which has already been set out in this Review.¹ Mr. White also discusses the more obscure question of the relation of this codex, and especially of the first quaternion of it in its present condition, to the *Codex Grandior* described by Cassiodorus in *De Institutione Divinarum Litterarum*; but it is impossible here to go into that subject. It only remains to express our gratitude to the editors of this volume for the service they have rendered to critical research, and our hope that their energy may be rewarded by a rich harvest in the field of Biblical criticism, to be reaped by the school of students which they have done their best to foster and encourage at Oxford.

Some Aspects of Sin. Three courses of Lent Sermons, preached in the Cathedrals of St. Paul's and Lincoln, and in the Chapel of Keble College, Oxford. By the late AUBREY L. MOORE, M.A., Honorary Canon of Christ Church, &c. (London: Percival and Co., 1891.)

PROBABLY only those who knew Canon Aubrey Moore personally can realize the loss which the Church sustained by his premature death, last year. The outside world had had comparatively little opportunity of knowing him, as it is only since his death that much of his work has been published; and but little of that work had received its final shape from the hand of its author. That work may, however, show something of the character and the comprehensive ability of his mind. He was keenly alive to, and deeply interested in, the progress of criticism and enquiry in the departments of history and of natural science; but his studies in these provinces, so far from blunting, as some persons seem to suppose they must necessarily do, his sense of the predominant truth of the Christian creed, only seemed to provide material to increase the fervour and earnestness of his faith. This may not seem much to say, for it may be hoped that there are few who really doubt that the fullest acceptance of the truths of science and history is perfectly reconcileable with the most absolute faith in the truths of religion; but the energy and thoroughness with which Canon Moore realized the problems presented by each of these great sides of truth made him at once a most singularly attractive personality and an almost invaluable teacher in such a place as Oxford. Therefore, those who knew him well will welcome the appearance of any portion of his work which may remain in such a shape that it can be given to the world. The little volume now

¹ *C. Q. R.*, January 1888.

before us represents part of that which was the central force of his life. It does not, like most of his work that has appeared lately, deal with either history or science, but with the great truths of religion which dominate every other province of life and thought. It dwells on some of the fundamental facts of human nature, and chiefly that in which all men, whatever their creed, their capacity, or their life, must agree—the fact and the sense of sin. As simple, straightforward, thoroughly practical Lenten addresses, these fifteen short sermons cannot be too highly commended. Possibly they may appeal with especial force to those who heard them delivered, or who can recall to themselves the man who delivered them; but they can come amiss to no one. They do not speak of any new thing; but they recall, simply and clearly and earnestly, the truths which must continually be brought up before us, and for the consideration of which the season of Lent is especially suitable. The first course, spoken in the Chapel of Keble College, deals successively with the several parts of the text, 'Watch ye, stand fast in the faith, quit you like men, be strong. Let all your things be done with charity' (1 Cor. xvi. 13, 14). The second, delivered at St. Paul's, speaks more directly of sin in its several aspects, as separation from God, as disease, as transgression of law, as a debt, and as a bondage. The third, spoken in Holy Week in Lincoln Cathedral, treats of the relations of the disciples to their Lord, and draws some of the natural lessons from the story of the betrayal by Judas, the desertion by the Apostles, and the denial by St. Peter.

A misprint on the title-page may be noticed, by which Canon Moore is spoken of as a Fellow of Magdalene College—a slip which would not have passed the author's own eye.

Poems. By CHRISTINA G. ROSSETTI. New and enlarged edition. (London: Macmillan and Co., 1890.)

It is perhaps no very high praise to say of Miss Rossetti that she is the best of living poetesses in England; for since the death of Mrs. Browning there has been but little poetical work done by women which can rank high in contemporary literature. Still, so far as it goes, the praise is, we think, true; and this edition of her collected works may give many an opportunity of becoming acquainted with a writer whose verse, if not of the first order of genius, is yet well worth more than a passing notice. Its character is more easily appreciated by personal acquaintance with it than by description. Miss Rossetti has not the vivid imagination or the highly-coloured language of her brother, Dante Rossetti, and in poetic force she is not equal to that original and striking genius; but she shares with him a certain tone of melancholy, a habit of dwelling on the more pathetic or solemn aspects of things, which runs through the greater part of her work. It is poetry in a minor key throughout. Three words of which she is very fond are:—

'Hope, memory, love :
Hope for fair morn, and love for day,
And memory for the evening grey
And solitary dove' (p.167).

But 'the hope I dreamed of was a dream, was but a dream;' and the love is not the fiery passion which kindles her brother's sonnets, but a love conscious of the sadness which sometimes attends it, and the separations, whether for a time or for ever, which are a part of its lot; and the memory is the memory of years which have been filled with hope and love such as these. The whole thought is expressed in the very pretty poem entitled 'Echo' (p. 147):—

'Come to me in the silence of the night;
Come in the speaking silence of a dream;
Come with soft rounded cheeks and eyes as bright
As sunlight on a stream;
Come back in tears,
O memory, hope, love, of finished years.

O dream how sweet, too sweet, too bitter sweet,
Whose wakening should have been in Paradise,
Where souls brimful of love abide and meet;
Where thirsting longing eyes
Watch the slow door
That opening, letting in, lets out no more.

Yet come to me in dreams, that I may live
My very life again though cold in death:
Come back to me in dreams, that I may give
Pulse for pulse, breath for breath:
Speak low, lean low,
As long ago, my love, how long ago!'

Many who do not know the name of the writer must have heard and admired the song which has for its refrain 'And if thou wilt, remember, And if thou wilt, forget' (p. 179). The same idea runs through another of Miss Rossetti's poems—namely, the sonnet, which is one of her best, beginning—

'Remember me when I am gone away,
Gone far away into the silent land;'

and which ends with the fine lines—

'For if the darkness and corruption leave
A vestige of the thoughts which once I had,
Better by far you should forget and smile,
Than that you should remember and be sad' (p. 105).

It would not be right to call Miss Rossetti's poems pessimistic. There is too keen a perception of the beauty of the world, and too strong a faith in the blessedness of the hereafter, to justify that epithet. But they are undoubtedly coloured throughout by the sense that the world is full of labour and weary longing and waiting, and that full happiness is not to be expected on this side the grave.

'Life is not sweet. One day it will be sweet
To shut our eyes and die: . . .
Life is not good. One day it will be good
To die, then live again' (p. 137).

And one of the most beautiful lyrics in the volume, 'Dreamland' (p. 50), is based on the kindred theme of the blessedness of rest:—

'Rest, rest, for evermore
 Upon a mossy shore ;
 Rest, rest at the heart's core
 Till time shall cease :
 Sleep that no pain shall wake ;
 Night that no morn shall break
 Till joy shall overtake
 Her perfect peace.'

It is noticeable that this tone of melancholy is more strongly marked in the earlier poems than in those which compose the second series included in this volume. Regarded simply as poetry, we think the first series ranks the higher ; but the later poems show but little falling off, and their more cheerful and settled character stands in pleasant contrast with their predecessors, as suggesting a life which has passed from dissatisfaction to content and patience ; as it is expressed in the poem 'Till To-morrow' (p. 352) :—

'Long have I longed, till I am tired
 Of longing and desire ;

My wish and joy stand over
 Until to-morrow ; Heaven is glowing
 Through cloudy cover,
 Beyond all clouds loves me my Heavenly Lover.'

One department of Miss Rossetti's poetry remains to be mentioned, namely, her religious verse. In this the sense of dependence upon a Heavenly Father finds full and earnest utterance, and the dissatisfaction with life, which has been noticed as characteristic of her writings, takes the form of a longing for the time when 'night is passed and lo ! it is day.' The following little poem has been included by Professor Palgrave in his *Treasury of Sacred Song* :—

'Give me the lowest place : not that I dare
 Ask for that lowest place, but Thou hast died
 That I might live and share
 Thy glory by Thy side.

Give me the lowest place : or if for me
 That lowest place too high, make one more low
 Where I may sit and see
 My God, and love Thee so' (p. 287).

And in conclusion let us quote the sonnet 'After Communion' (p. 266), with its expression of the supreme moment of the Christian's communion with his God :—

'Why should I call Thee Lord, who art my God ?
 Why should I call Thee Friend, who art my Love ?
 Or King, who art my very Spouse above ?
 Or call Thy Sceptre on my heart Thy rod ?
 Lo, now Thy banner over me is love,
 All heaven flies open to me at Thy nod :
 For Thou hast lit Thy flame in me, a clod,
 Made me a rest for dwelling of Thy Dove.
 What wilt Thou call me in our home above,

Who now hast called me friend ? how will it be
 When Thou for good wine'sttest forth the best ?
 Now Thou dost bid me come and sup with Thee,
 Now Thou dost make me lean upon Thy breast :
 How will it be with me in time of love ?

1. *John Wesley*. By J. H. OVERTON, M.A. (London : Methuen and Co., 1891.)
2. *John Wesley, being Dead, yet Speaketh*. By JOSEPH HAMMOND, LL.B., B.A. (London : S.P.C.K., 1891.)

THESE are two contributions by Churchmen to the voluminous literature of the Wesleyan Centenary. Both writers are well qualified for the task—the former not only by his perhaps unrivalled knowledge of the personages of our eighteenth century, but also by the fortune which has made him rector of Epworth ; the latter by having himself been brought up in Dissent, and by having for several years laboured in the thick of Methodism in Cornwall.

If we may first get rid of whatever disparaging criticism we have to make on Canon Overton's little book, it must be confessed to be rather discursive. The excellent scheme sketched out in the headings of the chapters is not strictly adhered to. It is hardly under the title of 'Wesley as an Itinerant' that we expect to find the account of his conflicts with the Bishops, nor under that of 'Old Age and Death' that we should look for the account of his so-called ordinations, or of the component elements of his Society. Surely, in view of the tremendous issues of the schism, we ought to have had a whole chapter devoted to the relations of Wesley and the Methodists to the Holy Church and its authorities, and not to have been left to gather the facts from random notices here and there. It is perhaps a matter of less importance, but in the chapter on 'Friends and Opponents' we miss what forms so valuable a part of Southey's *Life of Wesley*—an account of the character and labours of some of the chief lay-preachers whom he set to work. It is impossible, in our opinion, to gain any conception of the way in which Methodism took hold upon England without knowing something of such men as John Nelson and Thomas Olivers.

But in spite of the somewhat irritating lack of consecutiveness and working out of one subject before another is taken up, Canon Overton's book forms, on the whole, the best brief biography of Wesley with which we are acquainted. It is written with an abundant command of material, with a broad historic sympathy, and with a sense of humour which would often have saved Wesley himself from mistakes. The man stands before us in the nobility of his absolute single-mindedness, of his intrepidity, of his life-long ardour of devotion, of his rational and practical tone of mind. No one who reads this little book will be liable to fall back into Southey's estimate of his character (shared by many of Wesley's contemporaries), according to which he was a scheming and ambitious man, who loved power for its own sake. Autocrat as he was—quite as autocratic as Mr. Booth—he never sought power, but, having it, he exercised it vigorously, and

was not inclined to part with it to anyone else who might wield it to purposes other than those for which he believed himself to have been entrusted with it. How free he was from vanity in the ordinary sense of the word, with what profound humility he received instruction and rebuke from persons greatly inferior to himself in every way, is well brought out in these pages; although it might have been pointed out how little he had of that form of humility which is allied to diffidence and to reverence for authorities and rules. It was, as Canon Overton shows, a character of the most naïve simplicity. Perhaps he might have shown a little more explicitly how that very simplicity made him often offend and alienate those whom he wished to win; as in the case of William Law, or of his sweeping denunciation of Oxford life when he preached before the University. Never was any man less like the typical Jesuit, though the name was so often bestowed upon him.

Some points are brought out in this book which we do not remember to have seen brought out before. For one of these we are peculiarly grateful to Canon Overton. Southey and others had given the account of an interview between Wesley and 'the Bishop of Bristol,' without giving the latter's name. There have been Bishops of Bristol whose judgment upon John Wesley would not greatly have concerned anyone; but Canon Overton has drawn attention to the fact that this bishop was none other than the great Butler; and the scene becomes at once charged with an interest perhaps unsurpassed by that of any other incident in the life of either of the two men. It is difficult not to be haunted by the recollection of it. The profound and law-abiding modesty of the great philosopher and saint seems to have been shocked beyond endurance by the extravagant claims of Wesley. 'Sir,' he said, 'the pretending to extraordinary revelations and gifts of the Holy Ghost is a horrid thing, a very horrid thing' (p. 100).

Mr. Hammond's little work is an admirable collection of what may be called Wesley's strictures upon Wesleyanism. Nothing could be more cogent, if it were once granted that Wesleyans were bound to be at all points guided by the teaching of their founder. This however, is a thing which we suppose that few of them would be willing to concede; and we confess that we cannot think that any such obligation rests upon them. Wesley was not infallible, and we see no reason why Methodists should treat him as such. If they are not convinced of the value of Catholic principles on higher authority than his, it seems to us but irritating to array the authority of Wesley in their favour—and all the more so because Wesley's own action was utterly inconsistent with any full and clear belief in the Catholic principles on behalf of which he argued.

Indeed, both these two books, but especially Mr. Hammond's, appear to us to be tainted by the paradoxical and confusing opinion entertained by many opponents of modern Methodism, that John Wesley was one of the best and most loyal of Churchmen. That Charles Wesley was so, or would have been so but for his brother's influence, is more possible to maintain; but as for John, we think

that Mr. Green by no means overstates the case in the words which Mr. Hammond frequently quotes, when he says that though Wesley never intended to found a sect, yet 'with what seemed to some a strange contradiction, he made provision for one' (*Mission of Methodism*, p. 139). We believe that Dr. Rigg is not far wrong in maintaining that Wesley, in spite of his strong language about the sin of separation from the Church, 'not only pointed, but paved, the way' to the present position of the Methodist bodies (*The Churchmanship of John Wesley*, p. 104).

There were three things in Wesley's work which, in spite of his fatal blindness to their issues, could not but lead to schism. The first was the very composition of the Methodist Society. Though Wesley was fond of inveighing against 'leaving the Church,' the fact is that a vast proportion of the members of his Society had never joined it. They were recruited from the Dissent of the day, which was even duller and colder than the Church. And Wesley expressly renounced the idea of trying to make them members of the Church. His idea was only to form a private union of earnest souls of all denominations to aid one another in 'escaping from the wrath to come,' without enquiring into the particular belief of each one with regard to controverted points. This is well brought out by Canon Overton (p. 211). It shows that the doctrine of the one Catholic Church was not to Wesley's mind a doctrine of surpassing importance, else he must have made each convert from Dissent give up the false principles in which he had been trained, and in default of this must have refused him admission to the Methodist Society. The second fact to be remembered is the persistent, systematic way in which Wesley outraged the sacred principle of jurisdiction. No account of Wesley with which we are acquainted has sufficiently drawn attention to this fact, though it is one easily seen. He preached, he administered the sacraments, he founded religious societies, without the smallest regard to the judgment of the incumbents, diocesan or parochial, with whose charges he was interfering, even when the aggrieved incumbents were men like Butler of Bristol, or like Walker of Truro. No doubt if Wesley had gone loyally away from the places where his work was refused, the number of places where it was welcomed would have increased rapidly—so that it was not really a choice between silence and defiance; but even if it had been so, no Churchman could have doubted which was the right course. If Wesley had really been a Churchman he must have woven his Society into the very framework of the Church. It was not enough to charge them to attend the parish church; it ought to have been insisted that the societies should be under the direction of the bishop of each diocese, and of the incumbent of each parish, with Wesley himself as a general organizer. Possibly the number of the societies would not have been quite so great, but it would then have been a Church movement, which as a fact it was not. And then, thirdly, how is it possible for Wesley to be considered as a Churchman at all when once he took upon himself to ordain, even if it had only been for America? It surprises us to find Mr. Hammond, in

his zeal to show the nullity of the present Wesleyan 'self-ordinations,' even appearing to argue that there was something, in comparison, half-churchlike in these profane and presumptuous acts of Wesley's. Even supposing that presbyters and bishops were the same—and it was already a departure in mind from the Catholic position thus to set up a single ill-informed mind against the judgment of all the Christian ages—yet when did a private presbyter undertake to ordain? The fact is that Wesley had so long accustomed himself to consider himself as a special instrument of God that he no longer felt himself to be a private presbyter. The same spirit of setting himself above all rules which breathed in the impious statement, 'The world is my parish' (inscribed not only on his new statue, but alas! in Westminster Abbey), made him also suppose that as an extraordinary apostle he could confer upon his fellow-presbyter Coke an authority which Coke would not have had without him. We are not now concerned with Wesley's personal guilt in the matter, for we are ready to believe that Wesley was quite simple and sincere throughout, and had no idea that he was making a direct schism with his own hands; but we wish to point out that these so-called ordinations of Wesley's latter years were not unaccountable freaks inconsistent with all his previous history (though Charles Wesley himself regarded them as such), but that they were of a piece with fifty years of flagrantly unchurchlike action, and of practical denial that the souls of a diocese are entrusted to the bishop by Christ Himself. Wesley's love for the Church is undoubted, but it was not the love of one who understood the Church's nature. When once he had undertaken to ordain, the fact that he still continued to receive the Church's Communion can only be regarded as an accident, and an accident not wholly creditable to the Church.

Methodism and the Church of England. A Comparison, by a Layman. (London: Griffith, Farran, Okeden, and Welsh, 1891.)

THE chief value of this little volume is that it is written (as the Preface implies) by one who has seen both sides. In other words, the writer is, we presume, an instance of the leakage which has been going on for some time from among the younger and more intelligent Methodists into the Mother Church. We heartily congratulate him on the evident comfort and restfulness which he has found in his new home; we are quite sure that he has acted rightly, and sympathize with his laudable desire to bring over others of his former co-religionists into the same fold. But whether he is quite competent to do justice to so important a subject as that which is discussed in this volume is another question. It is true that he tries to disarm criticism by modestly owning that he 'makes no pretence to the possession of special learning or knowledge,' and that his work is not written 'for scholars or learned theologians, but for plain, ordinary Christians.' But, surely, even 'plain, ordinary Christians' want guiding aright; and, in a case which rests very much upon history, 'special learning or knowledge' *does* seem requisite for their guidance. So, in all friendliness for one whose aim is so admirable, we really must ask whether it is quite correct to make

such a sweeping statement as 'he [Wesley] ordained and consecrated as though he was a Bishop of Bishops' (p. 19). Surely, as a matter of fact, John Wesley scrupulously avoided using the terms 'ordain' or 'ordinations' at all; and as for his 'consecrating,' we have not the remotest idea what the writer means. Again, he quotes Mosheim's authority for stating that 'England north of the Thames was mainly christianized by the natives'—that is, as the immediate context shows, by the ancient Britons—'and south of that river by the Romans' (p. 81), an historical theory which is now utterly exploded. The Thames was not the line of demarcation at all; but, roughly speaking, the northern part of England owes its Christianity mainly to the missionaries from Iona, who are entirely ignored by our layman; the southern part to the missionaries from Rome; while the remains of the British Church helped the south quite as much as the north. So very popular and obvious a book as Montalembert's *Monks of the West* might have put the author right here. On page 152 he really seems to write as if he thought Good Friday was a 'festal day,' a 'great Festival.' Such, at least, would be the grammatical sense of his words; but we do him the justice to believe that his grammar, not his theology, is here at fault. We must, however, utterly demur to the statement that 'in Wesley's own lifetime there broke off from his infant society the curious sect named after the Countess of Huntingdon' (p. 163). Lady Huntingdon's Connexion never belonged to Wesley's society, infant or otherwise, so it could not have broken off from it. Was it a hazy idea of the famous Calvinistic controversy occasioned by the Conference minutes of 1770 that the writer had in his mind? The layman, again, is terribly unfortunate in his quotations from Greek and Latin. 'Ἐνὶ τῷ αὐτῷ is a phrase we cannot construe, and *σολομένους* is a word which does not exist (p. 99). 'Si fractus illabatur orbis' is a line that does not scan, and occurs nowhere. It is an ungracious task to pick out faults in a work with the scope of which we cordially agree; but, as the layman is fond of Latin, he doubtless remembers a passage beginning 'Non tali auxilio,' and we fear it is applicable to his case.

The Oxford Movement. Twelve Years, 1833-1845. By R. W. CHURCH, M.A., D.C.L., sometime Dean of St. Paul's, and Fellow of Oriel College, Oxford. (London: Macmillan and Co., 1891.)

THIS is far too important a work to be dealt with in a 'Short Notice.' It covers the whole ground of the most eventful religious movement of modern times, and is written by the one man who, above all others, combines the various qualities essential to the adequate performance of a most delicate and difficult task, viz. a personal knowledge of the chief actors in the drama; perfect fairness and, at the same time, hearty sympathy with the effort; a thorough grasp of the bearing of events *quorum pars magna fuit*; and a literary power almost unrivalled, which enables him to do full justice to an exceptionally interesting subject. We must be content at present with cordially recommending the book to our readers, particularly to those who

have read Cardinal Newman's correspondence, which is to a great extent on the same subject.

SERMONS.

- 1 *Cambridge Sermons*. By the late J. B. LIGHTFOOT, Lord Bishop of Durham. (London : Macmillan and Co., 1890.)
- 2 *Sermons Preached in St. Paul's Cathedral*. By the late J. B. LIGHTFOOT, Lord Bishop of Durham, sometime Canon of St. Paul's. (London : Macmillan and Co., 1891.)
- 3 *The World and the Man*. By the Right Rev. HUGH MILLER THOMPSON, D.D., Bishop of Mississippi. (London : Wells Gardner, Darton, and Co.)
- 4 *Twelve Sermons by the late Eugène Bersier, D.D., of L'Eglise de l'Etoile, Paris*. Translated by Mrs. ALEXANDER WAUGH. (London : James Nisbet and Co., 1891.)
- 5 *Magnificat*. A Course of Sermons by HERBERT H. JEAFFRESON, M.A. (London : Kegan Paul and Co., 1891.)
- 6 *The Prayer of Humanity*. Sermons on the Lord's Prayer. By H. N. GRIMLEY, M.A. (London : Kegan Paul and Co., 1890.)
- 7 *The Spirit of Discipline*. With an introductory Essay concerning Accidie. Sermons preached by FRANCIS PAGET, D.D., Canon of Christ Church, Oxford, &c. (London : Longmans, 1891.)
- 8 *Preparation for Worship*. Five Short Addresses on the Last Answer in the Church Catechism. By F. E. CARTER, M.A. (London : Longmans, 1891.)

It seems to be regarded in every quarter as a sort of axiom, or self-evident proposition which needs no proof, that the power of the pulpit is a thing of the past. From Professor Mahaffy downwards we have heard of the 'Decay of Modern Preaching,' the fact of which is assumed, while the only thing to be done is to account for the sad fall. Whether the pulpit has really lost the power it once possessed is a question which need not here be discussed ; but if it has, we cannot think that the sole, or even the chief, cause lies in a falling-off in the matter or form of the sermons themselves. Of course, in this, as in every age, feeble sermons are preached and even published, which should never have been uttered, much less printed. Of course, also, account must be taken of the law of the survival of the fittest. Naturally, the rubbish perishes, and the valuable endures. So if we compare the sermons, say, of South, Barrow, and Jeremy Taylor with those of our contemporaries, Messrs. Brown, Jones, and Robinson, the comparison will probably be in favour of the earlier preachers ; but if we take two batches of sermons at haphazard, one composed in the seventeenth, and the other in the latter part of the nineteenth century, it is far from certain that the advantage will lie with the earlier.

Here we have eight volumes before us by seven different preachers, which, to say the least, are worthy of being preserved in a printed form. Let us begin with those which, from the rank of the writer, and in some respects also from their intrinsic merit, properly claim our first attention.

Fun
ripe
vict
and
whi
firs
Ser
from
mos
bish
He
abo
Ser
wall
Bish
the
and
gain
was
earl
he n
' Be
Sun
from

can
this
to fir
retir
inspi
mind
every
misu
Choc
centl
the c
This
by th
worse
God's

to yo

A dr
God's

T
lanec
Engl
migh
VO

Volumes 1 and 2 are published by the Trustees of the Lightfoot Fund; and both, it is almost needless to say, bear traces of that ripe scholarship, that pure, easy, and cultured style, that deep conviction of the truth and vital importance of the Christian religion, and, we are bound to add, that lack of definite Church teaching, which are to be found in everything that Dr. Lightfoot wrote. The first eight of the *Cambridge Sermons* are entitled 'Trinity College Sermons,' the rest 'University Sermons;' the first range in date from 1861 to 1875, the second from 1868 to 1883. What strikes us most forcibly is that the very reverse of the old adage, 'Make a bishop and spoil a preacher,' is true in the case of Dr. Lightfoot. He 'keeps his best till last;' and it is easy to see how this comes about. When Dr. Lightfoot was preaching his 'Trinity College Sermons,' his spiritual experience had not ranged far beyond the walls of Trinity College; but when he accepted the great post of Bishop of Durham, which he never sought, he threw himself with all the ardour of a young man into the practical work of the diocese; and his sermons naturally reflect the increased experience he has gained. And this experience availed him quite as much when he was addressing the young men among whom he had passed his earlier years as when he was addressing their elders. Never did he make a more striking appeal than in his splendid sermon entitled 'Bethel,' and preached in Great St. Mary's Church, on the 19th Sunday after Trinity, 1881—that is, some years after his removal from Cambridge to Durham:—

'When again—you young men—when again, in the years to come, can you hope that the conditions of your life will be as favourable to this spiritual self-discipline as they are now? Where else do you expect to find in the same degree the opportunities for private meditation and retirement, the daily common prayer and the frequent communions, the inspiring and sanctifying friendships, the wholesome occupation for the mind and the healthy recreations for the body, every appliance and every aid, which if you will only apply them aright, neither disusing nor misusing them, will combine to build up and to perfect the man of God? Choose ye, this day. To you, more especially, I appeal, who have recently commenced your residence here, and to whom, therefore, with the changed conditions of life a heightened ideal life is also suggested. This is the momentous alternative—Shall your life hereafter be typified by the barren rocks and the monotonous waste, hard and dreary, if nothing worse; or shall it be illumined within and around with the effulgence of God's own presence, so that

The earth and every common sight
to you shall seem

Apparelled in celestial light,
The glory and the freshness of a dream?

A dream? Nay, not a dream, but an everlasting reality, eternal, as God's own Being is eternal' (pp. 307-8).

The *Sermons Preached in St. Paul's Cathedral* are on miscellaneous subjects, and, except that one would hardly expect such good English and such thoughtful matter in the ordinary parochial sermon, might have been preached in any parish church.

VOL. XXXII.—NO. LXIII.

T

(3) These are the *Baldwin Lectures* for 1890, a sort of American 'Bampton's' founded 'for the establishment and defence of Christian Truth.' A completer contrast than that between the sermons of the English and those of the American Bishop one can hardly conceive. Instead of the carefully polished periods, the elaborate elucidations of his text, which we find in Bishop Lightfoot, Bishop Thompson, whose subject is the Temptation of our Blessed Lord, goes straight to the moral he desires to point, and fearlessly hits the blots of modern American life. His sermons are quite as interesting, and would be, we should imagine, more effective for the audience he was addressing, than those of the English prelate would have been. But it would shock the proprieties if any English bishop, in all the dignity of lawn sleeves, were to address an English congregation in the rough and utterly unconventional but wonderfully incisive language which Bishop Thompson uses. It would not be enough to say that he is not afraid of 'calling a spade a spade.' If there were any American slang-term for spade which would be more effectual for bringing home what he meant to his audience, he would not be in the least afraid of using that. One specimen out of hundreds of a similar sort will illustrate what we mean :—

'The corruption of our politics is having its reaction upon the corrupters. The American politician is one of the most remarkable as well as the most sinister developments of all time. To have votes enough is to be on the heights of earthly felicity. He has made the word "popular" the measure of excellence. A man is "popular;" he is therefore a blessed man. A preacher is "popular;" he must therefore be the best and most admirable preacher. A patent pill is "popular;" it is incumbent on us all to swallow the pill. A measure is "popular;" there is no further question of its justice or wisdom. "Popular" expresses the final measure of all earthly perfection in pills, preachers, or politics! And yet the man has an inner contempt for the poor rag-god he is down on his knees before. He beats him and abuses him, as a Congo negro his mumbo-jumbo. He buys him in the market. He buys him with money, or with his own abject and unmanly service. He is his slave. He dares have no will of his own, and express no opinion of his own. And yet he despises the pitiful master he adores' (pp. 186-7).

The good Bishop reminds one of a still more famous cleric, his fellow-countryman, Parson Wildbore, of the *Biglow Papers*. It is, however, all very well to smile at or to be shocked at such language in a sermon; but we really want such plain speaking on this side as well as that side of the Atlantic.

(4) Here we come to yet a different type of sermon—as different as France is different either from America or from England. France has long been famous for her preachers; and if there are no such great names as those of Bossuet, Massillon, Bourdaloue, and Dupanloup among the French Protestants, yet these too have had true pulpit orators among them, such as the Monods and, we may certainly add, M. Bersier. Of course, the doctrine of a French Protestant will scarcely satisfy an English Churchman; but there are few points in these sermons with which the latter will disagree. Only he will

desiderate something further, with which the preacher himself *would* disagree. For example, in the excellently worked out sermon on 'The Narrowness of the Gospel,' he would expect to find a yet further limitation, which would naturally not occur to one who regarded all Christian societies as Churches. But, so far as they go, the sermons are exceedingly good, and the translator has done *her* work so admirably that, except for the matter, no one would suppose that they were translations at all.

(5) This is another type still, but equally good of its kind. Instead of being addressed to a general congregation, Mr. Jeaffreson's sermons are intended for people, all of whom are presumably in earnest about spiritual things; for they were preached at a Retreat, and no one would care to go to a Retreat who had not, to say the least, some serious thoughts. For such persons the sermons are admirably adapted. The preacher adheres closely to his text, and in a plain, unpretentious way draws out the various lessons deducible from the most glorious of all hymns. He quite steers clear of fanciful or strained interpretations on the one hand, and of mere vapid truisms on the other. The simplest can understand, and the most learned may derive profit from, his words.

(6) These, unlike any that we have noticed yet, are simply the parochial sermons of an English parish priest, and are dedicated by the preacher to his parishioners. They treat an old subject in a somewhat new way. They are, the writer tells us, 'the outcome of a long-cherished resolve to attempt to show how the great truths, the Fatherhood of God, and the Brotherhood and Sisterhood of Humanity, are enshrined for us in the Lord's Prayer.' The idea seems to have been suggested by eleven remarkable letters of Mr. Ruskin, which we well remember having read about eleven years ago in one of the monthlies. Mr. Grimley has done good service by bringing out forcibly and well a point which, in these days of hot controversy, is apt to be forgotten, viz. the bearing of each petition of the Lord's Prayer on the welfare, not only of the individual petitioner, but of humanity at large. In other words each petition is so framed as to develop sympathy with man *as* man, created in the image of God.

(7) Dr. F. Paget's volume opens with an 'Introductory Essay concerning Accidie.' Are we underrating the attainments of our readers if we hazard a conjecture that the great majority of them have not the remotest idea what 'accidie' means? We are not going to let out the secret, because if they do not know, they may be induced by curiosity to consult the volume and find out. Thus they may be led on to read the sermons which follow, and that will certainly be to their profit both intellectually and spiritually. Thoughtful, scholarly, and highly poetic, they are yet simple enough for all to understand. The one which has struck us most is that for Easter Day, which brings out very forcibly the thought suggested by the Easter text, 'Christ being raised from the dead dieth no more,' contrasting the permanent character of the risen life of Christ, and therefore of

the resurrection life of all Christians, with the transient nature of all earthly types of the Resurrection.

(8) These are addresses rather than sermons, but as they belong to the pulpit, they may fairly be regarded as belonging to our present subject. They fill only fifty-five short pages, but they are perfect little gems. Dealing with the old, old words which close the Church Catechism, they give them a freshness of meaning, a personal application, which cannot fail to be most helpful to all who desire to prepare themselves or others for the great act of worship.

To sum up, we cannot but think that any intelligent person, after a careful study of these eight volumes, when he is next asked what he thinks to be the cause of the decay of modern preaching, would be inclined to move the previous question—*Is there a decay?*

BRIEF NOTES ON NEW BOOKS, NEW EDITIONS, PERIODICALS, &c.

FOREMOST in these Brief Notes, *honoris causâ*, must be placed the *Facsimile of the Original Manuscript of the Book of Common Prayer*, signed by Convocation, December 20, 1661, and attached to the Act of Uniformity, 1662 (13 and 14 Charles II. cap. 4), (London and Cambridge: Eyre and Spottiswoode, and C. J. Clay and Sons, 1891). The history of the loss in 1819, and the rediscovery in 1867, of this manuscript, which is generally known as the Annexed Book, has been so often related that it seems superfluous to repeat it. This volume, we are told in a very brief 'Preface of the Publishers,' is issued as a companion volume to the Book of Common Prayer revised by Convocation A.D. 1661, which was reproduced in *facsimile* A.D. 1871, for the Royal Commission on Ritual of 1867, and is commonly styled the Convocation Book. It was from this book that the Annexed Book was fairly written out.' It is extremely interesting to possess, as we now do, a facsimile of the original manuscript of the Prayer Book of 1662, but in some respects we are not sure that the Convocation volume is not on the whole more instructive. In it, with its six hundred alterations we can see the Prayer Book to some extent a-making—so far at least as the changes at the Final Revision are concerned. There is, however, one correction, or rather erasure, even in the original manuscript which we hope, when it comes to be generally known, may put an end to a very objectionable diversity of use which can plead no sort of excuse, unless it be the pleasure, which seems dear to some minds, of violating the plainest directions of a Rubric. It will be remembered that the three Collects (for the Day, for Peace, and for Grace) are preceded by a Rubric of which the concluding words, 'all kneeling,' would seem to ordinary minds to govern the posture of priest and people alike. In many churches, however, the rubric is defied, and the priest stands. In the facsimile now issued we find that the rubric which precedes the versicles, or *Preces*, before the three Collects, originally ran: 'Then the Priest standing up *and so continuing to the end of the service* shall say.' But as the manuscript now stands, the words we have placed in italics are carefully erased. Could there be a more explicit intimation that the direction 'all kneeling' in the next rubric applies to the

priest as well as the people? We cannot now pursue the enquiry how those nine words, so erased, ever made their way into the manuscript of the Prayer Book as 'annexed.' There is no trace of them in the companion volume or in any previous editions of the book. In any case the erasure is highly significant.

The general get-up of this volume, the tint and quality of the paper, &c., reflect the highest credit on the publishers. We have seen it stated that all the copies were subscribed for some time before the day of issue. It is to be regretted that they were not more numerous.

The Official Year-Book of the Church of England, 1891 (London: S.P.C.K.), has reached, we believe, its eighth year. It contains, as usual, a vast congeries of information, more or less ably digested, relating to the multitudinous aspects of Church work in this country. With some of the details crowded into this goodly volume of 702 pages (including advertisements) we might with advantage dispense. Such a chapter, for example, as that on Parochial Work (p. 51) seems to us absolutely useless. If it be desirable that the work should be widely circulated, it ought to be issued in a much less costly form. A volume, the size, say, of Whittaker's Almanac, would be very much handy for reference, and might be sold at less than half the price. In the list of Cathedral Services we find mention more than once of what is popularly known as the 'Three Hours Service,' or as it is here sometimes called 'The Three Hours Agony.' But under the head of St. Paul's Cathedral this is described as follows:—'The interval between the 10.30 and 3.15 services was occupied by meditations on the "Seven Words from the Cross."' It seems odd that the same service is described in three different ways. 'Quot Decani tot sententiæ' is, we suppose, the explanation. We cannot, perhaps, expect a uniform designation for a service unknown to the Book of Common Prayer. We hope that in a future issue, the Editor will specify distinctly in which Cathedrals the Holy Communion is administered on Good Friday.

So far as we know, the two latest issues of *The Ancient and Modern Library of Theological Literature* (London: Griffith, Farran, Okeden, and Welsh, 1890) are *Sermons and Essays on the Apostolical Age*, by A. P. Stanley, M.A., Dean of Westminster, and *An Exposition of the Creed*, by John Pearson, D.D., sometime Lord Bishop of Chester, with an Analysis by the late W. H. Mill, D.D., 2 vols. Two minds in more striking contrast than those of Dean Stanley and Bishop Pearson could scarcely be conceived. The value of this edition of Pearson is much enhanced by having Mill's famous analysis prefixed to it. And to think that the whole may be had, tidily bound in cloth, for 3s. ! If we are not much mistaken, our original edition of Mill's Analysis alone cost us double that money.

The Divine Society: or, the Church's Care of Large Populations. Six Lectures on Pastoral Theology delivered in the Divinity School, Cambridge, May Term, 1890, by Edgar Jacob, M.A. (S. P. C. K.), contains some good advice to candidates for ordination. Canon Jacob shows how the Church and its organization is adapted to

meet the wants of modern society. We are glad to see that he presses strongly the truth that money and work spent on Foreign Missions will not be taken away from Home Missions. The influence of the Bishop of Durham is strongly marked throughout the book. In *The Historical Character of the Old Testament* (S.P.C.K.) the Rev. J. Eckersley, M.A., vicar of Wednesbury, argues with very considerable power, and in a concise form, against the acceptance of the new views of Wellhausen, Kühnen and Co., as to the authorship of the Books of the Old Testament. The warning against the desire to be always up in the latest theories is much wanted, and on that ground we most cordially recommend this little book, the substance of a paper read before the Handsworth Clerical Society. We wish, however, the writer did not allow himself to apostrophise the 'Shades of St. Thomas and St. Peter!' In an attempt to parody the critical method by applying it to Hamlet (p. 48) he produces a not very successful imitation of this form of argument. We have also received from S. P. C. K. *Straight On*, by the Rev. Francis Bourdillon, M.A., containing homely and straightforward advice to young men, if they would only take it; and *First Principles of Christ*, by the Rev. Alfred F. Russell, M.A., rector of Chingford; besides fourteen stories, most of which seem not to fall short of a very creditable mediocrity. Among these we may notice *Jennard's Leader*, by Edward W. Hoare, M.A., which gives an expurgated version of Stanley's last expedition (neither truth nor fiction gain by being closely mixed together); *Coral and Cocoa Nut*, by F. Frankfort Moore, takes us to Samoa and introduces us to some very remarkable adventures; others, such as *Seven Idols*, by F. E. Reade, and *Gladys*, by Edith M. Daughlish, deal with home life, and are more directly religious in subject. The illustrations of these and of all the others are, as usual, very bad. Might we express a doubt as to whether 'Christian Knowledge' and the cause of the Church are much helped by the production of such a great amount of second-rate books, in which neither 'knowledge' nor 'Churchmanship' are salient features?—quality is perhaps too much sacrificed to quantity. *The Birth and Growth of Worlds*, a Lecture, by A. H. Green, M.A., F.R.S., Professor of Geology in the University of Oxford (S.P.C.K., London, 1890: Romance of Science Series), was doubtless of interest to the audience to whom it was delivered when illustrated by a magic lantern. We are glad to see the Society has begun to put dates to its publications.

A Sacred Dictionary: an Explanation of Scripture Names and Terms, by Francis Bourazan (late C.M.S. Missionary in Palestine), (London: James Nisbet and Co., 1890). Here the student may learn that *Cæsar* is a Greek word, and means *cut* or *gash* (are we to conclude that Cæsar was so called because he was brought into the world by a Cæsarian operation?); that the Parthians are the same as the Persians; that tin is formed of lead or other inferior metals, mixed with silver ore and separated from it by smelting; and a great many other things that nobody ever knew before.

Lay Sermons for Practical People, edited by the Rev. Freeman Wills (London: Griffith, Farran, Okeden, and Welsh, n.d.), con-

tains a collection of lectures 'spoken to mixed audiences in Lambeth [*sic*] Polytechnic Institute, on Sunday afternoons, and are published from shorthand reports.' Sir John Lubbock, Dr. Richardson, Mr. Herbert Gladstone, the Rev. H. C. Shuttleworth, and others, have been pressed into the service. Seven out of the nineteen lectures were given by clergymen; but, as the editor says, 'I think the nature of their addresses entitles me to include them under the general heading of Lay Sermons.' But why?

Two numbers of the *Classical Review*, February and March, 1891 (London: David Nutt), are before us. They show that it continues to perform a very useful function as a record of advances in all departments of classical study. The chief interest of the March number lies in the collection of emendations to the newly discovered *Constitution of Athens*, which occupy nearly twenty pages. Some of the articles do not seem to be of much value.

The Economic Review. Published Quarterly for the Oxford University Branch of the Christian Social Union. Vol. i. No. 1. January, 1891. (London: Percival and Co.) This new Quarterly is, we are told, 'primarily intended for the study of duty in relation to social life. It will therefore contain articles dealing with what may be called Economic Morals from the point of view of Christian Teaching' (Preface, p. 1). The list of contributors contains most of the well-known names of writers on Economics. The first number begins with an address by the Bishop of Durham on 'The Educational Value of Co-operation,' in which he expresses his belief in the future of co-operation, notwithstanding obvious difficulties. The most interesting article is an account of the Progress of Socialism in America by the Rev. M. Kaufmann, in which he shows that society in the United States is exposed to all the same dangers that we are accustomed to in Europe, and that the democracy has not hitherto shown any special skill in meeting them. Mr. Symes contributes a short paper containing an able criticism of the Eight-hour Movement, and Dr. Cunningham a thoughtful discussion of the Ethics of Money Investments. There is added a review of recent Legislation, Parliamentary Inquiries, and Official Returns, which ought to be very useful. The *Review* deserves success; it would, we think, be more useful if it were more distinctively Christian and less exclusively 'moral' than this first number is. If the editors do not intend to compete, on its own lines, with the *Economic Journal*, it will be necessary to associate it definitely with positive teaching; the danger they have to avoid is that of vagueness.

The English Historical Review, Jan. 1891 (London: Longmans, Green and Co.) maintains its usual high standard of excellence. The first three articles in this number deal with subjects of ecclesiastical interest. Mr. G. C. Macaulay gives a graphic account of 'The Capture of a General Council, 1241,' a strange episode in the struggle between Frederick II. and the Popes. Miss Mary Bateson summarizes the evidence on the condition of the monasteries in the Diocese of Canterbury, contained in the manuscript account of Archbishop Warham's Visitation. She shows, as against Froude, that

Warham's Register 'lends no support to the theory that the inmates of religious houses were steeped in inhuman wickedness' (p. 35). Father Pollen, S.J., gives some account of Dr. Nicholas Sander, author of the book *De Schismate Anglicano*, the most widely received account—from a Roman point of view—of the Reformation in England. It is only right to mention that Father Pollen's view of the value and accuracy of Sander's book is borne out by the more independent judgment of our own great living authority on the history of the Reformation, the Rev. Nicolas Pocock.

The Dublin Review, Jan. 1891 (London: Burns and Oates), contains pleasant articles on the late Lord Houghton and on Scott's 'Journal.' The Rev. Francis Wyndham gives a full account of the Trial of the Maid of Orleans. The name of Mr. Luke Rivington is placed at the close of twenty-five pages of sneers at the Church of which he was recently an ordained minister, *à propos* of the Lincoln Judgment, which he endeavours to show is fatal to the Catholicity of the English Church.

The articles in the *Critical Review of Theological and Philosophical Literature*, Feb. 1891 (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark), are too slight to call for any special notice. Professor Macalister, however, makes some valuable criticisms of Mr. Frazer's *Golden Bough*; and Professor Herbert Ryle passes a very glowing encomium on Mr. G. A. Smith's *Isaiah* in the *Expositor's Bible Series*, which is at the same time accompanied with criticisms which deserve close attention, considering the quarter from which they come.

W
be
is s
pre
and
wo
por
sign
bee
St.
eth

for
the
Chr
pict
of S
can
and
Epis
impe
mov
for a
could
gone
large
His
Scrip
religi

1
VO